



**COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE  
CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
DRAFT MINUTES**

**TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 20, 2016**  
Rinconada Library – Embarcadero Room  
1213 Newell Road  
Palo Alto, CA 94303  
5:30 PM TO 8:30 PM

1 **Call to Order: 5:35 P.M.**

2 **Co-Chair Keller:** I call the meeting to order of the Citizens Advisory Committee on the  
3 Comprehensive Plan for Tuesday, September 20th. It is 5:35 p.m. Will the secretary please call  
4 the roll?

5 Present: Filppu, Fine, Glanckopf, Hetterly, Hitchings, Keller, Kleinhaus, Levy, McDougall,  
6 McNair, Moran, Nadim, Packer, Peschcke-Koedt, Summa, Sung, Titus, Uang,  
7 Uhrbrock, van Riesen

8  
9 Absent: Emberling, Garber, Kou, Wenzlau

10 **Robin Ellner:** Also, I've been asked to announce for those of you attending the subcommittee  
11 meeting on the 27th and October 5th, Chitra has your parking passes.

12 **Female:** (inaudible)

13 **Robin Ellner:** Safety and Natural Environment.

14 **Female:** (inaudible)

15 **Robin Ellner:** 27th and the 5th. There's one subcommittee meeting on the 27th for Safety and  
16 Sustainability. On the 5th is the Natural. See (inaudible) after the meeting.

17 **Oral Communication:**

18 **Co-Chair Keller:** Thank you. We start with Oral Communications. The first one, it says Rebecca  
19 Byne. Is that correct? You will have 3 minutes.



**COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE**  
**CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE**  
*DRAFT MINUTES*

1 **Rebecca Byrne:** Good evening, Commission. My name's Rebecca Byrne. I'm here on behalf of  
2 Housing Choices Coalition. We're a nonprofit that helps people with developmental disabilities  
3 find housing throughout Santa Clara County. In Palo Alto, there are 472 residents with  
4 developmental disabilities, who are adults that need housing. I'm just here to encourage you  
5 when you're doing land use or any other relevant policies to just consider these residents,  
6 because there is a tremendous need. I know that you guys can find the solution. Thank you.

7 **Co-Chair Keller:** Thank you. The next speaker is Maria Marriott. By the way, I appreciate the  
8 brevity of the first speaker.

9 **Maria Marriott:** Hi. I am a resident of Palo Alto. My name's Maria Marriott. I have a son with  
10 developmental disabilities. He's 18, and we will be one of those people who is looking for  
11 housing in the area. We would like him to be able to be close enough that we can help him to  
12 learn to function on his own. Having housing in Palo Alto would be great. We're longtime  
13 residents. Thank you.

14 **Co-Chair Keller:** Thank you. The next speaker is Esther Nigenda.

15 **Esther Nigenda:** Good evening, Esther Nigenda speaking for Save Palo Alto's Groundwater.  
16 Groundwater is part of our natural environment, and yet it gets no respect. For years, I  
17 assumed that if the City permitted pumping and dumping of groundwater into the Bay and if  
18 our environmental groups did not object, then it must not be a problem. It wasn't until the  
19 State mandated a 25-percent reduction of water use because of the drought and that we  
20 continued pumping and dumping water that this didn't seem to make sense at all. As an



**COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE**  
**CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE**  
*DRAFT MINUTES*

1 emergency services volunteer, I thought we'll need this water especially if the drought  
2 continues for a decade or more. Mega droughts lasting 20 or more years have happened in  
3 California before. With climate change, the likelihood that this will happen again is even higher.  
4 As a scientist, I could no longer ignore my gut feeling and go with the conventional wisdom, and  
5 so I joined Save Palo Alto's Groundwater. Our mission is to protect our community  
6 groundwater and promote its use in a sustainable manner. Groundwater has many uses  
7 including being the primary source of drinking water for over 50 percent of the United States'  
8 population. It is used for growing crops. Shallow groundwater recharges our deeper aquifer,  
9 our streams, rivers and wetlands. It is used in many industrial processes, and it supports our  
10 structures and infrastructures. As an aside, not many people know that due to overdrafting of  
11 our groundwater, Palo Alto subsided 2-4 feet in the 1960s and that this subsidence stopped  
12 when we started importing 100 percent of our potable water from the Hetch Hetchy reservoir.  
13 Used sustainably—this means having a groundwater budget and knowing how much we can  
14 extract every year without overdrafting—groundwater protects us from saltwater intrusion and  
15 subsidence. Dewatering for construction purposes is not using the water, but rather  
16 considering it construction waste. When dewatering is needed for some community purpose  
17 such as for the construction of a Public Safety Building, we propose that measures should be in  
18 place that limits the amount of groundwater extracted by following best construction practices  
19 and mandating that all groundwater extracted be recharged to the aquifer or used for  
20 beneficial purposes such as irrigation, firefighting, street cleaning and dust suppression. To



**COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE**  
**CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE**  
*DRAFT MINUTES*

1 discourage waste of groundwater, any water extracted from the ground should be metered and  
2 charged at market rates. In Palo Alto, bones and rotting food are considered a resource to be  
3 composted, not waste. We should apply the same philosophy to our community groundwater.  
4 Thank you.

5 **Co-Chair Keller:** Thank you. Last speaker is Rita Vrhel.

6 **Rita Vrhel:** Hello. Rita Vrhel. I'm also with [savepaloaltosgroundwater.org](http://savepaloaltosgroundwater.org), and that would be  
7 hard to follow Esther. I just returned from a trip to New Mexico. All across Arizona and New  
8 Mexico and in southern California the topic was saving water, either the drought and/or how  
9 can water restrictions help save water. One way is not to pump out our precious groundwater.  
10 I was going to have a 3-minute video tonight of the sound of 30.88 million gallons being  
11 pumped from one house, 736 Garland, my poster child for dewatering. That equals 686,000 45-  
12 gallon rain barrels. This is from one house. We know this is accurate because the City actually  
13 metered it. Water is our most important resource. If we had to go to a stream or walk 10 miles  
14 like some unfortunate individuals in the world have to do to obtain water and we're not even  
15 talking about clean water, we would probably value it more. Right now, you can go right across  
16 the street from Hoover Park, and you can see groundwater being pumped into the storm drain.  
17 Many residents were at the Hoover Park ice cream social on Sunday, absolutely outraged when  
18 they saw this pumping of a valuable community resource. I don't know if any of you or all of  
19 you have seen the amount of water that's being pumped down the drain. The City this year for  
20 the first time is metering, and they're also mandating Purple Pipes to have groundwater go into



**COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE  
CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
DRAFT MINUTES**

1 their truck one day a week. The problem is that the City is not supplying enough electricity so  
2 that adequate pumping can occur. When I spoke with Joe of Purple Pipes yesterday, because I  
3 was going to use some of their water for myself, they could only fill one truck a day. I think it's  
4 really time that perhaps you, the Citizen Advisory Committee, start putting some teeth in do we  
5 think water is important or do we just want to throw it away. When we're talking about  
6 increased growth and continued housing development and population increase in Palo Alto and  
7 the Bay Area, where is this water going to come from? Everybody taps into the aquifer. East  
8 Palo Alto is having their business development halted until more water can be found. I think  
9 we really shouldn't wait until it's too late. Thank you very much.

10 **Co-Chair Keller:** Thank you very much.

11 **Staff Comments:**

12 **1. Recap of City Council Discussion on Draft Transportation Element**

13 **Co-Chair Keller:** Next we have Staff recapping the long and late City Council meeting last night  
14 that some of us attended, including Lydia Kou who is now not feeling well today. Also, I want to  
15 mention that we have a resignation. Bob Wenzlau decided to resign from the CAC. Before we  
16 continue, I'll just say that—I'll take a moment to talk about how we work together. One of the  
17 things that Dan Garber has stressed and I've also stressed is that the meetings of the CAC and  
18 the subcommittees need to be safe places. We have a lot of work to do. To do that work  
19 effectively, the CAC and subcommittee meetings need to be collaborative and inclusive places  
20 where differences of opinion can be expressed civilly and everyone's opinions can be heard and  
21 valued. I hope that you'll keep this in mind at all our meetings. Next, staff, Hillary.



**COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE**  
**CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE**  
*DRAFT MINUTES*

1 **Hillary Gitelman:** Thank you, Arthur. Thanks to those of you who did attend last night. The  
2 City Council received your draft Transportation Element and offered some very constructive  
3 comments. I think all of the Council Members expressed their gratitude to the CAC and were  
4 impressed by the quality of the work product. They then went on to provide lots of suggestions  
5 about how we could make it even better, but we anticipated that. I think it really was a very  
6 constructive conversation. I think each of them had a handful of suggestions or edits or things  
7 that we could do to tighten it up. It really was in the realm of tightening it up. I don't think  
8 they identified any big topics that we missed, maybe some questions about emphasis on the  
9 part of some members of the Council, and then a desire by some to reduce the number of  
10 programs, reduce the amount of introductory text, sort of comments that we were all  
11 anticipating. Thanks again to all of you who had a hand in that. I thought I'd let you know what  
12 we think will happen next with this. The Council did ask to see it again after they've had a  
13 chance to look at the Land Use Element. What we're going to do is use the version we gave to  
14 the Council last night, which was your draft, as a base document. We're going to accept all the  
15 changes that were in that, and then from now on we'll be tracking changes so you'll be able to  
16 see exactly how it changes. We're going to make some changes to reflect the input we got  
17 from the Council, share it with them again, and then it'll come back to you when we put all of  
18 the elements together. Once you get through all the other elements, you'll see it again, and it'll  
19 have those track changes. You'll see exactly how it's been modified since you forwarded it to



**COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE**  
**CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE**  
*DRAFT MINUTES*

1 the Council. Congratulations. I think the Council really appreciated your work on this. I think  
2 it's a great step forward for this process.

3 **Co-Chair Keller:** Thank you. Now what we're going to do is go to the Land Use and Community  
4 Design Element. First we're going to start as—first we're going to have a discussion by staff  
5 introducing what's happened. Then we're going to go as is usual to the members of the  
6 committees first.

7 **Agenda Items:**

8 **Elaine Costello:** I'm just going to say a couple of things, and then Joanna—am I on? I just  
9 wanted to sort of give you the context of where we are and where we're going on projects  
10 before we launch into the two elements that we have tonight, which are Land Use and the  
11 Natural Environment. Our goal is to forward the Land Use Element to the Council tonight. They  
12 were eager to see it at the Council meeting. They're looking forward to it. That's our primary  
13 goal. We're just launching the Natural Environment discussion tonight. We know from the  
14 discussion at the last CAC meeting that some of you—all of you have been wonderful in giving  
15 so much of your time. Some of you at the end of the year for various reasons may not be  
16 continuing on with the CAC, so we are trying to make sure that we can get through as much of  
17 the Natural Environment and the Safety Elements before the end of this year. We sent out a  
18 schedule, and that shows that the upcoming October, November and December CAC meetings  
19 will be devoted to the Natural Environment and Safety Elements, and that the members of the  
20 sustainability committee, the safety committee and the natural environment committee will be



**COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE**  
**CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE**  
*DRAFT MINUTES*

1 holding a number of meetings to sort of review each of those documents before they come to  
2 you. That's just sort of where we are and where we're headed. The goal is to finish Land Use so  
3 that we can launch into these others. By the end of December, we'll still have a lot of work to  
4 do in terms of the Economic and Business Element and implementation and a number of other  
5 topics. The substantive elements, our goal is to get through as much as we possibly can with  
6 the original CAC members. Any questions on that? With that, I'm going to turn it over to  
7 Joanna Jansen from PlaceWorks to go through where we are on the Land Use Element, how we  
8 followed up with the land use subcommittee on the issues that you had at your last meeting  
9 and what the status of that is pretty quickly so we can get to your comments and thoughts.

- 10 **1. Action: Land Use & Community Design Element**  
11 **a. Introduction of Revised Draft Element, including the five issues identified at the**  
12 **August CAC meeting**  
13 **b. Report from the Land Use and Sustainability Subcommittees**  
14 **c. Discussion of Draft Element**

15 **Joanna Jansen:** Thank you, Elaine. I'm just going to run through what has happened on the  
16 Land Use Element first, since the last time we were altogether as a group in August, since that's  
17 the first topic on the agenda. If you recall the last time we were in this room, near the end of  
18 our meeting Hillary and Arthur and others did a great job of kind of summarizing the input that  
19 we had heard and the outstanding issues that needed to be addressed and kind of assigned  
20 those to the sustainability and the land use subcommittees. Those topics included housing  
21 affordability, the urban forest, coordinated area plans, basements and what was at that time  
22 called performance measures. We met first with the sustainability subcommittee, and they





**COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE**  
**CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE**  
*DRAFT MINUTES*

1 focused on performance measures and moved those forward in a couple of different ways. We  
2 added detail to what are now called development requirements that are in Table L-1 of the  
3 element, in terms of requirements that will be placed on new projects as they are approved  
4 and as they are constructed. In addition to that, recognizing that those are really going to be a  
5 relatively small percentage of the built environment that's on the ground in 20 years from now,  
6 we also spent additional time on the community performance measures, which are now called  
7 community indicators and which measure the performance not only of new development but  
8 also of all of the existing buildings and the actions of existing residents and existing workers as  
9 well as future residents and workers over time. We also made some important changes to  
10 those indicators. You can see in Table L-2 in your Land Use Element that one got quite a bit  
11 longer. We added things like corridor travel times, air pollution, unoccupied homes, additional  
12 indicators on the urban tree canopy, on groundwater contamination and really a broad range of  
13 different issues that were important to the subcommittee members. The other thing to  
14 understand about the development requirements and the community indicators is that what  
15 we're anticipating is that two options for these tools will go forward to the City Council. In this  
16 meeting last time, we came up with the ideas of, one, having all of the detail about these items  
17 in the Lane Use Element, so a detailed Table L-1 for development requirements for new  
18 development and a pretty detailed Table L-2 with ways that we're going to evaluate the  
19 performance of all of the buildings in Palo Alto. Including that detail in the Land Use Element,  
20 making those decisions now and including that in the adopted Land Use Element is one option.



**COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE**  
**CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE**  
*DRAFT MINUTES*

1 In your staff report, that's actually referred to as Option 2. Option 1 would be to just include a  
2 program in the Land Use Element that says you should develop something. You should develop  
3 a list of requirements and you should develop a list of community indicators through a  
4 subsequent transparent, open, inclusive process, etc., but we shouldn't try to hammer that out  
5 right now as part of the Comp Plan. We heard both of those ideas last time at the full CAC.  
6 Because we've heard both of those ideas, we are planning to carry forward both as options.  
7 Both are relatively fully fleshed out at this point in your draft Lane Use Element. Certainly your  
8 comments and thoughts are welcome on that tonight, but at least it's my understanding we're  
9 not trying to decide and choose one of those options tonight. We're going to be carrying both  
10 of those options forward to the Council for their consideration. The other four issues were  
11 looked at in more detail by the land use subcommittee. They looked at housing affordability as  
12 distinct from affordable housing. We spent a little bit of time talking about subsidized, below  
13 market rate, deed restricted units that are affordable housing and also just a much broader  
14 category of housing that is more affordable or some people call it more attainable simply by  
15 nature of its size, its design, its age, its location, etc., rather than being legally or otherwise  
16 restricted to a certain income level. There was support for ensuring that the Land Use Element  
17 really addresses both types of housing and of housing affordability more broadly. When we  
18 looked at all of the urban forest policies together, the committee didn't make any major  
19 additions to those programs and policies, but we did kind of refine them and added some new  
20 policies and programs, just increasing the recognition in the Land Use Element of the



**COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE**  
**CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE**  
*DRAFT MINUTES*

1 importance of the urban forest and involving urban forestry staff in project review, which is  
2 something that's already happened but can be memorialized in the Land Use Element. We  
3 talked a little bit about coordinated area plans. We have added options to the Land Use  
4 Element to expand what was formerly going to be focused on the Fry's coordinated area plan to  
5 the larger California Avenue area as well as considering a possible Downtown coordinated area  
6 plan. In terms of basements, this continues to be a very important issue. We've been hearing  
7 about this a lot. We've had speakers here tonight as well as at a number of our past meetings  
8 really emphasizing the importance of this issue and kind of the urgency of the issue. We have  
9 added a new multi-part policy that includes evaluating and regulating the potential negative  
10 impacts of basements, not only in terms of their impact from a land use perspective in terms of  
11 the occupant density or neighborhood character but also in terms of flooding issues, safety  
12 issues and urban forest issues as well as a recognition that the potential impacts of basements  
13 and their interaction with groundwater may change over time with sea level rise and climate  
14 change. That policy is all in the Land Use Element right now. Possible that over time some of  
15 those pieces may move to Natural Environment or the Safety Element, because of course they  
16 do have to do with both Natural and Safety topics. It's in the Land Use Element right now for  
17 your consideration. In addition, the subcommittee suggested that staff should bring forward a  
18 more immediate action for consideration by the City Council in light of the level of community  
19 concern about this topic. Finally, I just want to bring your attention to a list of outstanding Land  
20 Use Element issues that's in the staff report. You've got 17 numbered items here on pages 6



**COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE  
CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
*DRAFT MINUTES***

1 and 7 of the staff report. We wanted to highlight these because these are all changes that,  
2 while they look really small—they're just a line or two here—some of them could be pretty  
3 significant policy changes. They're ones that are important and have been raised primarily in  
4 the written communications that we've received both for your August meeting as well as for  
5 the intervening subcommittee meetings. We haven't really had a chance to talk about them,  
6 but your fellow members have put them out there. It's important to bring these to your  
7 attention. If anybody wants to discuss these, if we can get some resolution on any of these,  
8 we'll reflect that in the Land Use Element. If not, this list will also go forward to the City Council  
9 for their consideration.

10 **Co-Chair Keller:** Thank you. First, let the record show that Elaine Uang has joined us. Let me  
11 give some overarching remarks about process. There's a concept, paraphrasing Voltaire, that  
12 the best is the enemy of the good. There's also a concept of economics of the notion of  
13 decreasing marginal utility. We can continue to meet to try to—as Steve observes. We want to  
14 make sure that we don't drag out the process in such a way that we don't keep on  
15 incrementally improving it. We want to give it to the Council and let the Council look at it,  
16 evaluate it with the Transportation Element, and then give us feedback and figure out what to  
17 do from there. A couple of things. First of all, we are not going to have any votes except for a  
18 vote to recommend that the City Council consider the draft of the Land Use and Community  
19 and Design Element. Secondly, what I think would make sense is for all the comments that are  
20 made, either in writing submitted today or ones that you have a chance to submit before a



**COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE**  
**CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE**  
*DRAFT MINUTES*

1 week from today at 5:00. Mark your calendars, September 27th at 5:00, staff will be accepting  
2 comments. Those comments will go to Council along with the minutes of this meeting when  
3 this goes to Council in mid-November. Because of the timing, we really can't do this in October.  
4 It compresses too much and we would take time away from the other elements that we have to  
5 do. We're basically running out of time. We've spent a lot of time on this element. We spent a  
6 lot time on the Transportation Element. We've spent more time than we originally planned to,  
7 so I think it's important to move on with this and to gather your input. Therefore, what I am  
8 recommending you do at your comments now is to talk about your highest level issues that we  
9 can basically hear. This way, if there are people who agree or disagree with those issues, they  
10 can comment on that without being disagreeable and so we can see if there's any consensus  
11 that can go to Council based on the reading of their comments. In addition, you can write more  
12 between now and a week from today at 5:00. With that, going on. What I'd like you to do is if  
13 you are on the land use committee and, I think, the sustainability committee also met on this.  
14 If you're on either of those two committees and you met on this element, if you could raise  
15 your name tents and make them so that I can see the names, that's helpful. Thank you. We'll  
16 go to you first. I can't see your name, so turn it around. No, it's blank that side. Thank you. If  
17 you'd always keep your name tags so that we can see them up here, it makes it a lot easier for  
18 me. We'll first go to the people who were on the committee, and then afterwards we'll go to  
19 the other people. Sustainability as well. If you can make your name tag, Elaine, so I can see it.  
20 Thank you. I will start—yes?



**COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE  
CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
DRAFT MINUTES**

1 **Alex van Riesen:** Can I ask one clarification?

2 **Co-Chair Keller:** Yes.

3 **Alex van Riesen:** You said highest level. Are you suggesting that these are things that we have  
4 not yet talked about that are not mentioned or are you just asking people to drill home the  
5 thing that—I think we've pretty much expressed everything that could humanly, possibly be  
6 expressed. How do we avoid kind of redundancy here?

7 **Co-Chair Keller:** Let me say that I'm not going to control how you spend your time. We will  
8 take 2 1/2—I'll let you in on a little secret, and that is we don't actually get 3 minutes. We  
9 actually get an extra 30 seconds. Because time is limited, we're going to take 2 minutes and 30  
10 seconds for everybody to go this round. If you wish to use your 2 minutes and 30 seconds for  
11 things that you don't think are high-level comments, be my guest. On the other hand, the idea  
12 is to be as efficient and as high level of the important things as appropriate.

13 **Hillary Gitelman:** Can I add to that?

14 **Co-Chair Keller:** Sure.

15 **Hillary Gitelman:** Just having had this experience last night, I guess I will ask for your mercy.  
16 Think of us as the staff conveying your work to the City Council. What would you like us to  
17 report as your kind of high-level thoughts on this element as we bring it forward?

18 **Co-Chair Keller:** We'll start on this side. Steve, you can lead off.

19 **Stephen Levy:** I'm blown away by the collegiality of the subcommittee and the incredibly good  
20 reporting of Joanna and Elaine. I may not get a chance more, but I'd like to thank Shani and



**COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE**  
**CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE**  
*DRAFT MINUTES*

1 Doria and Annette and Jennifer and Hamilton and Alex and Amy. I hope I didn't miss anybody.  
2 On that, my priorities are what Joanna said, and I hope you convey them to the Council. I'm  
3 interested in the broader issue of housing affordability including below market, subsidized  
4 housing but also other housing. I think you've cleared up that language, so I hope you bring  
5 that forward to Council. It's certainly in the Housing Element. Second, I really hope that we're  
6 able—that the Council can help you with additional staff or whatever so we can proceed on all  
7 the area plans. I think the two that are the hardest may also be the ones that have the most  
8 impact, the ones that got left off the first time, Cal. Ave. and Downtown. I know there are  
9 staffing issues, so I'll support you in asking for help on that. There's all sorts of stuff going on  
10 Downtown. The last one is again thank you to the committee and to Joanna and Elaine. In my  
11 world of measuring stuff like water usage or energy usage or the condition of the roads—our  
12 roads have been going up since we've been putting infrastructure. Traffic and parking are really  
13 called community indicators. The importance of that is not the language, but it's what Joanna  
14 said. It reminds us that in a City of 68,000, where we could add 10,000 or 15,000, at the most  
15 heavy-lifting it's going to be on affecting the behavior of the existing residents, the existing  
16 workers and the existing companies. How do they use energy? How do they handle parking?  
17 How do they handle commuting? I haven't looked at the scope of the EIR, Joanna, for all of the  
18 scenarios. I hope that you're measuring not just the impacts of the new development but how  
19 we can mitigate existing.

20 **Co-Chair Keller:** Thank you. Elaine is next.



**COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE**  
**CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE**  
*DRAFT MINUTES*

1 **Elaine Uang:** I echo some of the things that Steve just said. I'm very glad to see the expanded  
2 language and definition for housing affordability and really glad to see the inclusion of  
3 coordinated area plans. I do agree with Steve that—if staff can get more staffing—the two  
4 really critical plans are probably Downtown, Cal. Ave. They have the greatest impacts. They're  
5 also our greatest opportunity, because they both—if you look at the map, they're the ones that  
6 are the most transit accessible, the most walkable. They already have the good bones to  
7 support a lot of the sustainable transportation initiatives that we had set forth in the  
8 Transportation Element. One thing that I do want to bring that is new and goes back to housing  
9 again. I think housing is not just about how many units are created or removed; it's also  
10 remembering that people live here. People who have lived here in the community for a long  
11 time often may not feel like they can stay here. Remembering that there's a human dimension  
12 to that is important. One concern that I have in reading this Land Use draft is that we haven't  
13 really thought very carefully about how we can expand those options to allow those folks to  
14 stay. We're losing people all the time. I don't think that even my kids are really going to be  
15 able to make many, many friends who are going to stay long term. I think if you look steadily at  
16 the sort of family formation cohort, they're increasingly renters, and they're just not able to  
17 stay here. Traditionally, that was sort of the bulwark of Palo Alto. Concern that we haven't  
18 really looked at the land use map. Again, I raised this in my notes last time, but I didn't get a  
19 chance to mention it in comments. I just want to bring it forward. 3 percent of our land, 3  
20 percent—I'm supportive of the 58 percent of land that is open space, but 3 percent of our land





**COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE**  
**CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE**  
*DRAFT MINUTES*

1 is designated multifamily dwelling, and only 0.7 allows mixed use. There's a really good graph  
2 in the existing conditions document I'd encourage you to look at. I'm just really sad that we  
3 haven't really taken a look at that map, and we haven't had the opportunity to say how can we  
4 change things. There's a policy noted—can we take a look at what are the things that are  
5 preventing construction of affordable housing and below market rate units? I think we already  
6 know what those are, but we haven't actually addressed them by looking at the land use maps.  
7 I think that we had an opportunity, and it'd be nice if we could take that extra step. Look at the  
8 map, look at where things can go and really make that and allow people to stay here long term.

9 **Co-Chair Keller:** Thank you. Annette.

10 **Annette Glanckopf:** I did turn in my comments, so I'll just hit the highlights. I would like to see  
11 captions on the photos. They're just sort of thrown in there with—though, they're very pretty  
12 but whatever. Just a couple of additions that I think we need to put. In Memorial Park, you  
13 need to add first responders. Dennis Burns as really our Police Chief is very—I'm glad to see the  
14 Memorial Park. On the staff comments, it would have been interesting to see where you  
15 actually want to insert them, like traffic lights, in the Comp Plan. The Eichler Neighborhood  
16 Program needs to have a special place for it. I don't think personally it belongs under building  
17 heights. I think it should be its own policy, and Individual Review needs to be next to it. There's  
18 nothing on either thing, so I think that along with this affordable housing issue, Eichlers and  
19 single-story overlays are critically important in our land use decisions. On the topic of housing  
20 again—back to the staff comments—there was a comment about prohibiting housing in



**COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE**  
**CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE**  
*DRAFT MINUTES*

1 Charleston Center, which I'm very supportive of. I think we need to add Midtown as well.  
2 There is a reference to that later on in page L-30 and also L-46. I would like to see both of these  
3 to eliminate housing. If we do build housing, we're going to kick out retail, and it's going to be  
4 basically unaffordable. I definitely think affordable housing is the key issue, whatever it is,  
5 however we want to define it. I think the Comp Plan needs to be stronger in our position.  
6 There's something in there that says work with stakeholders to find sites. I think we need to be  
7 more hard-hitting and be very specific and say, "Let's identify two sites from the Housing  
8 Element and then develop plans to make those sites affordable housing." As far as the  
9 performance measures, I'm one of those that are sort of on the speculative side. I think that  
10 they're very, very ambitious. In the chart—my vote would be the Council would pare them  
11 down. If we do use them in any shape or form, they need to be reviewed much more  
12 frequently than are indicated in the documents, 4 years. In some cases, it's—I have one more  
13 high-level comment. I think anything that goes forward should be majority and minority, and  
14 we shouldn't talk about how many people voted on one side versus the other.

15 **Co-Chair Keller:** Thank you. Doria.

16 **Doria Summa:** Hi. I have a lot of specific comments still, and I'm still a little sorry that we never  
17 had the time, but I understand why we didn't, in the process to really go through it at the  
18 subcommittee line-by-line. I think we could do some more work on—be more specific about  
19 what we want to see in Stanford Research Park with regards to caps or growth mitigations. I  
20 thought we had decided that we wanted in the C zones mixed land use that had retail and



**COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE**  
**CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE**  
*DRAFT MINUTES*

1 housing but not office. I'm not a big fan of having too many area plans, and I actually don't  
2 think we need one for Downtown. I think area plans work best when there's sort of a clean  
3 slate and are very problematic when you're imposing them over a built-out neighborhood. I  
4 think there could be stronger language in a couple of places throughout. I don't want to go into  
5 all the details. For protection of not just R-1 but all the low-density, residential  
6 neighborhoods—that's a big thing for me—I think we need to address the basement and  
7 dewatering issue in some more specificity. I think the urban forest language could be a little  
8 stronger. I'm really worried about people being displaced in the process of redevelopment, but  
9 I understand that is a very tricky issue. I'm not sure the best way to deal with it. I agree with  
10 Annette. I think the Eichler building thing was just in the wrong place. I think it should be in  
11 Goal 3. I continue to think that our emphasis on below market rate housing should be for the  
12 most vulnerable in our community, disabled or elderly, disabled adults and those with financial  
13 accessibility issues. Other than that—I also was concerned. I wanted to address some of the 17  
14 items. I wasn't sure which way you guys were stating them, whether there was a—like in  
15 Number 9, it says delete the last sentence and then in quotes it says ensure that each  
16 residential has such spaces. I think what that means is you're adding that last clause and  
17 deleting the existing last sentence. In some cases, those specifics were a little confusing for me.  
18 I'll leave it at that.

19 **Co-Chair Keller:** Thank you. Hamilton.



**COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE**  
**CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE**  
*DRAFT MINUTES*

1 **Hamilton Hitchings:** First, I want to start by saying I really agree with the comments of Annette  
2 and Doria. As for the subcommittee and for the Land Use Element, we took an approach which  
3 was not to try and come to compromise on everything, because it was clear that different  
4 opinions were sufficiently far apart we would not be able to. What we tried to do was come  
5 together on where we could and where we couldn't. Staff and Hillary and Elena have done a  
6 really nice job of laying out the different options for next City Council to be able to decide what  
7 to do. It took a lot of work but, Hillary, I have to say I'm impressed. Thank you very much for  
8 that. I do feel that this document is at a point where it's ready to go to City Council. We  
9 certainly need their feedback in order to finish it up. I am very concerned, as you know, about  
10 low income and displacement. From the data points I've seen, not only are these folks getting  
11 priced out but even if we build more housing, it will still not be within their reach, which is why  
12 I continue to advocate for below market housing. There is one specific area. If you look at  
13 Table L-1 and you look at Item Number 5, in Item Number 4 we talk about not displacing below  
14 market. In Item Number 5, we don't actually talk about increasing below market. I would like  
15 to see Number 5—we add below market housing as well as including affordable housing. For a  
16 lot of people, \$2,500 or \$3,000 a month just isn't affordable, and they're going to be priced out  
17 or they won't be able to live in this community, which will be a detriment to the community. I  
18 hope we can capture that in the version that goes to Council. Another area that I think we  
19 missed—I realized it when reading this over—is, I think, a giant loophole that anyone can build  
20 a big medical center and it not be covered under the office and R&D grant. We have an



**COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE**  
**CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE**  
*DRAFT MINUTES*

1 exemption for below 5,000 feet. Stanford Medical Unit is exempted. I think if someone else  
2 wanted to build a big medical facility, we shouldn't exempt medical from the office/R&D just  
3 because we already have those other exemptions in there. It's obviously going to be a big  
4 project at that point. The last thing I would say is in my subcommittee, I asked that we end the  
5 (inaudible) of dewatering. We do have the technology with cut wall and other construction  
6 techniques. I would like to see it banned or at least put that up to the Council as an option.  
7 Thank you.

8 **Co-Chair Keller:** Thank you. Jennifer.

9 **Jennifer Hetterly:** I submitted written comments. I'll try to just pull out the highlights. I  
10 thought the cumulative cap options were a little bit confusing, so I offered some language to  
11 clarify that, that I don't think changes the meaning at all. Development requirements and  
12 community indicators, there are several references to maintaining and protecting livability  
13 which, I think, suggests that we're at the high point right now for quality of life. I think that the  
14 significant dissatisfaction with existing traffic, parking, housing affordability suggests that we  
15 really want to be improving livability. I would like to see those changed to improve. Options 1  
16 and 2 completely lack any enforcement mechanisms. I think we need to add a program to both  
17 or alternatively it could go in that cumulative cap and development implementation program  
18 section that'll monitor compliance and set and enforce penalties for meeting the development  
19 requirements. As far as the tables, I prefer Option 2 mostly because, I think, we could fight  
20 forever over what are the specific examples used in Option 1. I like having the tables but, as I



**COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE**  
**CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE**  
*DRAFT MINUTES*

1 read it, that's not an all inclusive list of what are going to be the indicators. That's the starting  
2 point for discussion and developing indicators. Is that a correct understanding? Policy L-1.18  
3 has a bit about transparency and how data will be monitored and published regarding the  
4 community indicators, but there's nothing about calling for transparency and creating the  
5 indicators. I think that needs to be added as well as for creating the development  
6 requirements. I suggested how you could split out that program into two separate programs to  
7 cover that. I think we should periodically assess the development requirements themselves,  
8 not just the caps. If our community indicators are not getting where we want them to go, we  
9 should consider maybe these development requirements aren't the right ones or aren't at the  
10 right levels. I think there should be a program to periodically assess that as well. On  
11 basements, I would like to see the addition of reference to storm water management, to excess  
12 occupancy that was mentioned in the intro but it didn't show up in the language, to redefine  
13 flood zones as well as the construction practices that Hamilton referred to. I'll leave it at that.

14 **Co-Chair Keller:** Thank you. Shani.

15 **Shani Kleinhaus:** I had a lot of comments. One thing is it looks like you've done a lot of  
16 consolidation, and I like it. Some of the things that disappeared I would like to see back. I don't  
17 know if I'll get to cover all of those, because I have two bigger issues right now. One is what  
18 Rebecca Byrnes talked about, and that's housing for the bottom of the lowest people in this  
19 society. This is not affordable housing; this is not attainable housing. This is people that cannot  
20 afford it unless they're subsidized. I'm looking for a program for the City to partner with local



**COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE**  
**CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE**  
*DRAFT MINUTES*

1 nonprofits and whatever other government grants we can get, anything we can do, to  
2 accommodate those people. I think that probably belongs as another program under Policy L-  
3 1.3, to have another program specifically for those people who are the most vulnerable in the  
4 community and are not covered here. I also think that Program L-131 is not well written, and it  
5 needs a little more editing. I can see what you tried to do here, and it's the right direction for  
6 that, but it needs some editing. I would really like to see a program that really looks to care for  
7 those people. We have a huge need in this community. That may be seniors, and it may be  
8 those people with developmental disabilities. The other thing is a little difficult, because it's  
9 late. I tried to introduce it before, and it wasn't that easy. I spoke about it to City Council last  
10 night. That's the issue of having caps only and no performance measures and no requirements.  
11 I'll try and explain why and why I think that should be advanced as well as the other options.  
12 It's not there now. It's hard to explain to people who don't work with CEQA or the California  
13 Environmental Quality Act a lot. What we do when we have standards and requirements is we  
14 lose the granularity of spaces and specific areas. We say as long as you stand by all our  
15 requirements, we check the box. The person who usually checks that box is somebody who  
16 graduated yesterday from some school. As long there's something that covers that  
17 requirement and it looks okay, that box gets checked. All those elements that we have and we  
18 think that they'll be done in a really comprehensive way get a check in the box. Often for staff,  
19 it's almost impossible to say, "No, you can't build something," when the box is checked. What  
20 that does is it takes away the ability of us, the public, to comment and improve projects on a



**COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE**  
**CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE**  
*DRAFT MINUTES*

1 site-specific rather than some kind of an overall standard basis. This was a huge issue that the  
2 Governor actually issued orders to allow affordable housing projects and mixed-use projects to  
3 move forward. They didn't do it for office. We need to think about it, because the moment  
4 that we have those things to replace our ability to influence a project, our only way then is  
5 some kind of a referendum. I don't think people want to go there; it divides the community.  
6 Look what it's done to Palo Alto. I really think we should offer the alternative if anybody agrees  
7 with me. I said, "Let's do it," and they told me, "You're the only one." I work with CEQA on a  
8 day-to-day basis. I know it's power. It's our people power. That's what we get out of CEQA.  
9 While I don't necessarily think we should have no requirements, those should not replace—it's  
10 a hard and fine line to go. That could be something that staff can work on later. I don't think  
11 we are the forum that can solve that. I want that ability to just look at caps for now until  
12 maybe we catch a better jobs to housing ratio or something. To just say maybe we need to  
13 wait, we have some patience, let's build up the housing, let's deal with the environmental  
14 issues. Housing will continue to increase. The cost will continue to increase if we build a lot  
15 more office. We can put caps on office and let's look at what happens. I'm not suggesting caps  
16 on housing if anybody is reading it that way. I thought I should bring it up.

17 **Co-Chair Keller:** Thank you. If you have already spoken, if you could put your name sign down.  
18 Thank you. Don, you're next.

19 **Don McDougall:** Speaking in real general terms about a few things. One is the housing  
20 affordability. I think the terms that have been used is affordability, attainability, availability.





**COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE**  
**CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE**  
*DRAFT MINUTES*

1 Frankly, I like housing accessibility. Is it available and do the lower level of people that we're  
2 talking about here, lower income, disabilities and so on, have access to that by any means? I  
3 think Shani's comment about we should create partnerships wherever we can with nonprofits  
4 to help us with that—everybody knows that I rant about partnerships. I think that's really  
5 important. In fact, I think the other thing is I want to compliment staff for in here covering all  
6 the different possibilities, even a separate program or policy, I forget, on cluster housing. I  
7 think the one thing that is wrong here is we've dictated where we can't put housing. For  
8 example, Town and Country says no housing. There's a big parking lot. Are we absolutely  
9 certain that, if we're looking for affordable housing, isn't an opportunity to explore? I think that  
10 we should not be prescriptive to eliminate at least exploration. I want to speak again in favor of  
11 the idea of measures. I really like what staff has done and the committees. I think the  
12 committees did a great job of coming up with the idea of requirements and the idea of  
13 indicators. I like that. I think that there needs to be a transition of how we use them. I think  
14 Jennifer's right. Do we have all the right ones? The answer to that is no. Should we continue  
15 to explore it? I think that whatever we do we should start collecting measures to the extent  
16 that we have the staff and affordability and the data available to do that. Even if we're not  
17 using them, at least we're creating a base point. I agree with—I think it was Annette who said if  
18 we're going to have them, we should look at them more frequently. I do want to comment that  
19 at Council last night—I think everything we've done we've talked about the interconnectedness  
20 of things. Alexander von Humboldt. The transportation and the land use, they're connected. I



**COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE  
CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
DRAFT MINUTES**

1 think we've tried to do that. I think the other thing I want to comment on is—I think this is up  
2 to staff. I want to—I think for the third time now—compliment staff with what they've done  
3 here. I think it's up to staff to figure out if we're supposed to be detailed or suggestive. I think  
4 Council has given confusing and we're confused. Do we want to be more detailed or more  
5 suggestive? Thank you.

6 **Co-Chair Keller:** Thank you. Whitney.

7 **Whitney McNair:** Thank you. Addressing the annual cap. I appreciate the changes that are in  
8 the options, but I suggest that we take the two policies that are in the Comp Plan element  
9 here—it's Policy L-1.14 and 15; it's also Number 17 in the staff report—and blend them  
10 together. My suggestion is that there's a 50,000-square-foot cap within the City, an additional  
11 50,000-square-foot cap at the Research Park with the ability to roll over the unused  
12 development capacity with the Research Park. We'd already talked about the Medical Center  
13 being exempt. I would include the Research Park can be exempt from this annual limit if the  
14 City and Stanford enter into a mutually acceptable agreement with defined performance  
15 standards providing for alternative means of addressing auto trips to and from the Research  
16 Park. Any such agreement may not cause new or substantially more severe or significant  
17 environmental impacts than those that would be caused under the annual limit. I think it takes  
18 all the things we've been talking about and puts it into one comprehensive policy. As far as  
19 Policy L-1.11, I don't support including hotels in any of the caps. There hasn't really been a  
20 rationale that we've discussed here or provided of why we need to cap hotel rooms. If size of



**COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE**  
**CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE**  
*DRAFT MINUTES*

1 hotels is an issue with recent hotel developments, then the City should be looking at  
2 development standards within the Zoning Ordinance or study hotels separately. Just don't  
3 outright cap them without the information to support that idea. Within the development  
4 requirements, there is this one that says preserve low cost rents. That really can't be a  
5 development requirement, but maybe that's a goal. Community indicators, there's a percent  
6 commute trips to employment centers, which is new. I just don't understand the metric. It  
7 says 505 trips by SOC. I just don't know what that means. Number 8 in the staff report in Policy  
8 L-6.13 and the program—I've said this a lot of times in my written comments—there shouldn't  
9 be a prohibition on office uses in mixed-use developments. I understand there's a concern  
10 about office uses, but there may be places where a mix of uses including office is important.  
11 That's it.

12 **Co-Chair Keller:** Thank you. Amy.

13 **Amy Sung:** Right off the bat I wanted to say thank you. I read this draft and thinking that is like  
14 really, really capture a lot of discussion that took place in the subcommittee meetings. Thank  
15 you, Joanna and Elena. Wanted to start out with the housing that is affordable. I really think  
16 that captured the spirit of what we face as a City. Thanks, Don. I learned a new term, housing  
17 accessibility. Nonetheless, I think that what we can do is to use that as a basis for an inclusive  
18 community. What we face is not just a particular section of the population. We hear an outcry  
19 of all levels of housing need. What we need is to have housing choices that we accommodate, I  
20 wanted to repeat, the young and the old. The young people—we are here to draft a



**COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE**  
**CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE**  
*DRAFT MINUTES*

1 Comprehensive Plan that's supposed to last until 2030. This should be a guiding principle that  
2 will last that long. The young people until then probably will be middle of the range.  
3 Nonetheless, what we have to solve the problems today, I think it should be a Council decision,  
4 but what we lay out should be long term. I think that is something that I wanted to emphasize.  
5 Real quickly, I also wanted to bring back the ideas of putting housing in areas like Town and  
6 Country and also in the surface parking lots. Stanford Shopping Center parking lot to me is just  
7 a fabulous location for us to consider for housing. I also think that right now we are looking at  
8 limiting the office space; however, I just think it is a danger of putting an outright prohibition  
9 for that office space. Dewatering, this is very, very real. That is an issue that we need to look  
10 at. I think that dewatering is real impact to the tree roots, the canopy and also the impact to  
11 adjacent properties, because of the basement excavations. I think these are all real and needs  
12 to be looked at and studied with a scientific foundation and basis, so that we address this issue.  
13 However, I wanted to ask that basement will not be looked at as another area to fully restrict  
14 how houses should be built. Thank you.

15 **Co-Chair Keller:** Thank you. Our final of this half round is Alex.

16 **Alex van Riesen:** I just want to add my own thanks to all the work that's been put in. I find  
17 myself agreeing with a number of comments, especially with Hamilton and Jennifer. I guess  
18 one thing I wanted to come back to. The coordinated area plans have been mentioned a  
19 number of times. I've heard comments, everything from they should all be done to maybe  
20 prioritize one or two. This seems to me there needs to be a process established. I wanted to



**COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE**  
**CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE**  
*DRAFT MINUTES*

1 suggest a process for prioritizing these plans. It seems like we had two decided, but now it  
2 seems more up in the air. I guess behind that, what I wonder is what are the values that the  
3 City or the Council has for deciding which places should be developed, when, and then follow  
4 those. It seems like now there's some controversy about whether it should be the Fry's site,  
5 which I think a number of months ago was more of a priority, and now maybe Downtown. I  
6 think there's some argument for Downtown and Cal. Ave. because of the location of  
7 transportation, but I think there's potentially more opportunity to do stuff with what's  
8 happening at Fry's and in the other locations. I think that's the biggest concern. That's the  
9 highest level. In the report, it's the thing where we have the least clarity, the understanding of  
10 the coordinated area plans. I also wanted to urge the City Council to put the—I want to agree  
11 with a moratorium on basements until a clear policy going forward is achieved. I think City  
12 Council should do that immediately. What with being in a drought-stricken area and all the  
13 implications that we're unclear on, I don't know why we're allowing that to continue to happen.  
14 I think I read something—I think it's something Stephen put out—that the Council should  
15 consider a gradual increase each year beginning at 20 percent and moving towards 25 percent  
16 in terms of the amount of BMR housing. I thought rather than keep it at 20 or make it 25 is  
17 something that's prorated and moves a little bit over each year.

18 **Co-Chair Keller:** Thank you. First, I'd like to thank the land use and sustainability  
19 subcommittees for their comments. If you could all put down your tags and then, if you didn't  
20 speak in the first round, then you get to put up your tag now. We'll call you. We'll start again.



**COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE**  
**CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE**  
*DRAFT MINUTES*

1 If you could make your tags face me so I can see your names, that would be helpful. Lisa,  
2 you're first.

3 **Lisa Peschcke-Koedt:** This would be on the overall high-level comments, right?

4 **Co-Chair Keller:** Yes, these are your high-level comments on the element.

5 **Lisa Peschcke-Koedt:** I've got four items. Actually most of them aren't new; they're picked up  
6 somewhere here. The first one is I would still propose language in Goal L-1 that adds the word  
7 diverse. It would read a compact, diverse and resilient City, etc., with the diversity capturing a  
8 lot of what we've talked about, but for sure economic, age, ability. I really mean the broader—I  
9 think it sets the framework for a lot of the land use. I would still ask before it goes to Council  
10 we add the word diverse, because pretty much, I think, all of us have talked about it in some  
11 way. It can also cover the type of land use. I'm thinking more of the human diversity, but it can  
12 also cover that. That's Number 1. Second on the housing, still very passionate, several of us  
13 have said around affordable and below market and subsidized housing. To me it's all of those  
14 things. I like the accessible, because I may package it. It really is how do we get Palo Alto back  
15 to where all incomes, all different—just a mixture of us. The diversity of who can afford to live  
16 here. That said, I also think that folks with less money may live in multifamily units, in higher  
17 buildings. I'm not saying everyone gets a single-family residence on a big lot. That just isn't  
18 practical, but some sort of diversity with that and really targeting, I think, City workers, teachers  
19 and first responders, all that, and certain groups that we may want to set as a priority for the  
20 good of the City, whether it's disability, age, students, whatever. The third is the urban forest.



**COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE  
CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
DRAFT MINUTES**

1 Sorry. My third big is around urban forest and parks and open space. Critical to maintain and  
2 protect that as we go, even with our building, even with our changes. The last one, basements.  
3 I very much agree with what Alex said. I think for the basements we need to change the  
4 policies that—I think basements are fine—there be zero wasted groundwater coming out of the  
5 basements. That's on the developer; that's on the homeowner. If they can commit to that, it  
6 can go forward in the meantime while the City works out the policy on this. If not, I would also  
7 do a moratorium. I think this is critical. As one of our public speakers said, it's just such a waste  
8 of our very precious water. It's just horrible to see, and I think it's a fair thing. It is doable at a  
9 reasonable cost from the limited things I know about it. That's my last one on the basements.

10 **Co-Chair Keller:** Thank you. Bonnie.

11 **Bonnie Packer:** Like others, I want to congratulate the subcommittees for work really well  
12 done. The last couple of meetings, I spoke out against the caps and items that seemed  
13 somewhat draconian. I think this version has come up with what I wanted to call the thinking  
14 person's cap. You've tied it so well to the development requirements and the community  
15 indicators, which is what needed to be done. I congratulate you on that. I agree with what  
16 people are saying about the coordinated area plans. I think a coordinated area plan is really  
17 one of the best planning tools the City can use to really understand a particular area and figure  
18 out development standards for that area, for the uses in that area, that would work well there  
19 but wouldn't work in another part of the City. It's just that kind of fine-tuning, and you get  
20 community input, is really worth the extra investment. My message to this City Council and



**COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE**  
**CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE**  
*DRAFT MINUTES*

1 future City Council is try and find the means to pursue the coordinated area plans. I don't know  
2 which area should get priority at this point. Fry's has a lease that's going to expire, I think,  
3 that's driving that issue. They will decide that. I agree with what Lisa said about diversity. I  
4 think there are some items about diversity in the community indicators. As that list gets  
5 developed, other types of diversity could be included in there. Also, in my written comments I  
6 made a point—this is maybe not a big point. The word livability, I think, is a subjective kind of  
7 term. What's livability for me may not be livability for somebody else. I suggest removing the  
8 word in the appropriate places in the Comp Plan, because I'm not sure what it means. I think  
9 the community indicators is a way of arriving at that. I also suggest that you add using citizen  
10 surveys, SurveyMonkey-type tools, whatever is available, as the years go on to find out what  
11 the community is really thinking. The final thing, I'm heartened to hear so many people here  
12 talking about the need for affordable, attainable, whatever you call it housing. In order to do  
13 that, you have to be willing to have buildings that include these people who need the housing.  
14 You can't say, "We need to be sure we're not negatively impacting the environment, but we  
15 need affordable housing," but then say, "No, we can't built it because there's going to be a  
16 negative impact." There's balancing that has to be done and priorities. That's it for now.

17 **Co-Chair Keller:** Thank you. Julia.

18 **Julia Moran:** Echoing everyone else's comments, thank you all, subcommittee, for the work.  
19 This is clearly the beast of the committee. Better you than me. I'd have to agree with Shani  
20 and Don. I think that we do need to make sure that we have a very strong policy in this about





**COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE**  
**CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE**  
*DRAFT MINUTES*

1 our most vulnerable communities and partnering with nonprofits. More than anyone else  
2 who's spoken to us, we've had people come to talk to us from these communities. If we're  
3 going to listen to our citizens, we need to include this. I would also agree with Amy regarding  
4 dewatering and basements. I think that it's important that we're being environmentally  
5 responsible. I'm sorry, I can't remember your name. The woman from the emergency services  
6 brought up some great suggestions of ways that we can—teeth we can use with regards to  
7 basements. I don't want to muddle that with housing and not building housing. I think some of  
8 these suggestions here have nothing to do with the environment. Not allowing people to put  
9 bathrooms in basements is an entirely different issue and should not be included. I'd also agree  
10 with Don regarding—I don't think that we should include in the Plan—I don't think we should  
11 dictate where we can't put housing. I would add to that I don't think we should dictate where  
12 we can't put childcare facilities. It's one thing to say we're not saying we must put housing here  
13 and we must put childcare facilities. I disagree with saying that's absolutely not allowed. Just  
14 quickly, lastly, in the section of—the list that's going on to the Council of (inaudible) Land Use  
15 Element issues, most of these I disagree with. It seems to be a pretty skewed list. I hope that's  
16 rounded out in the final list that goes on to the Council. I think there are a lot of things in here,  
17 like the dewatering, where they will hinder new housing being developed and are put under the  
18 name of other things. I think we need to focus on that. Thanks.

19 **Co-Chair Keller:** Thank you. Jason



**COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE**  
**CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE**  
*DRAFT MINUTES*

1 **Jason Titus:** I'll be kind of short. The idea of having coordinated area plans for Downtown and  
2 California Avenue, whether it's specifically—whether we do something that is actually called a  
3 coordinated area plan or not, I feel that it's very important for us to recognize and convey in the  
4 document that, where we have public transit, this is the only place where we can effectively  
5 develop in ways that don't seem to bother people and create problems in all the ways that have  
6 come up again and again across parking and traffic and all of this. If we don't spent time saying,  
7 "How are we going to consciously manage the constrained resource we have around our public  
8 transit," then I don't think we're going to be able to develop effectively. I think it's great for  
9 Fry's to make sure we do good stuff, but it's not going to—we're going to be able to have a  
10 much more effective management of things like affordable housing if we're thinking about it in  
11 the context of how would people get to and from that housing without somehow substantially  
12 increasing traffic or parking problems. I do think if you look around both those areas, there will  
13 be in the next 15 years substantial redevelopment that happens. If you look at like where the  
14 SurveyMonkey building happened or where the High Street developments were, the next block  
15 down there is all—like on High near Alma, that's all auto repair. That will change, and how we  
16 change that, I think—I would like to imagine that it would be done in a coordinated manner  
17 considering transit, childcare, affordable housing, all of these things together and ideally with a  
18 view. Whether that's officially called having an actual area plan or not, I think it needs to be  
19 thought of holistically, not just one-off approvals or denials after long run-ups. Another thing. I  
20 agree with what Julia was saying and others around—I'm hesitant for us to actually write into



**COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE**  
**CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE**  
*DRAFT MINUTES*

1 the Plan, saying you shouldn't have housing in some specific area like in Midtown or at a  
2 shopping mall. I think in particular it is a weird thing to think about, like Stanford Shopping Mall  
3 parking as housing, but it is worth keeping in mind that how we—transportation, personal  
4 transportation in particular, is changing a lot. Like, it is changing pretty rapidly. I think much  
5 more rapidly than even people in this committee would have thought one year ago. The  
6 number of companies that are now starting tests with driverless cars is pretty astonishing.  
7 Fifteen years from now, what will Stanford Mall look like? I don't know. And Town and Country  
8 and all that. I probably wouldn't write into the Plan that you can't putting housing in these  
9 places, because that may be pretty—it's not very useful besides parking right now, and maybe  
10 it could be.

11 **Co-Chair Keller:** Thank you. Mark.

12 **Mark Nadim:** First, I concur with Doria about the mixed use labeling or this mixed use zoning.  
13 It should refer to residential and retail rather than residential, office and retail. We all know  
14 that we need the BMR; everybody is talking about BMR, senior housing and low income.  
15 Probably some of the best places for these developments are along El Camino and Cal. Ave.  
16 The main issue is we need to be very specific on what the building size and what requirements  
17 are applied to these buildings rather than going through the whole design process and then we  
18 have an appeal based on a subjective item. That would delay the development years. We need  
19 to be a lot more specific on what these buildings should look like. As for watering, we need to  
20 look at studies of the effects of the dewatering to the area, to the region. The Central Valley



**COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE  
CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
*DRAFT MINUTES***

1 has been pumping out underground water for irrigation for several years now. There has to be  
2 some studies that were done to evaluate what this has done to the land in the Central Valley.  
3 That's it. Thank you.

4 **Co-Chair Keller:** Thank you. Len.

5 **Len Filppu:** Thank you. It's really been an honor to work with this committee. I'm enjoying the  
6 mix of ideas and will add some now. I agree with Alex on the moratorium on basements. It's  
7 something we ought to move forward with real quickly. Here are comments on some of the  
8 outstanding Land Use Element issues that came in the memo. I agree that the plan should  
9 prohibit hotel use on sites adjacent to single-family neighborhoods., but that should also  
10 include low-density residential neighborhoods as well. That was Number 1. On Number 7, the  
11 policy about Eichler neighborhoods, first of all it should be moved somewhere within L-3. It's in  
12 the wrong place right now. I think that we do need to have some special regulations for Eichler  
13 neighborhoods but understand that there are competing points of view within the Eichler  
14 neighborhoods and neighbors. The policy should be developed with direct neighborhood input,  
15 very important. On Number 10, I agree that planning for the impacts on schools should be  
16 added to the Land Use Element, but I would argue why not have it in both, also keep it in  
17 Community Services and Facilities. It's a critical issue. It's an issue that's been neglected in this  
18 town for a long time. As the Comp Plan attempts to be consistent across all elements, making  
19 sure such an important item is in both places makes sense to me. On Number 13, I agree that  
20 the text should be added to prohibit housing in Charleston Center. I would include Midtown.



**COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE**  
**CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE**  
*DRAFT MINUTES*

1 These are neighborhood centers for primarily walkable retail. We ought to keep it that way.  
2 We've seen some situations where we have not kept it that way. These are not always great  
3 outcomes. My last one is Number 16, recognize public art and cultural facilities as a community  
4 benefit, I say yes, let's delete it. It hasn't worked. There's been a history of this very loaded  
5 phrase, community benefit, transforming from a Keith herring to a red herring. Thank you.

6 **Co-Chair Keller:** Thank you, Len. Ellen.

7 **Ellen Uhrbrock:** The first thing that I want to say is I am in complete awe of everybody that can  
8 do 469 pages in preparation for this meeting. I've admired very much all of your comments,  
9 because I know now that you have read it. I'd like to start off with the high level thinking that  
10 we really should emphasize the gateways that come into Palo Alto and the gateways  
11 connecting us with our other communities like Stanford. Going up University Avenue and Palm  
12 Drive, this could be a spectacular, welcoming gateway to both Stanford and to Palo Alto and the  
13 others. I think that would be money extremely well spent. A lot of the gateways are near  
14 heavy traffic areas, so this would be a good, over high level goal for the City. I'll add to that I  
15 agree with all the housing affordability. Consider making parking an affordability element too.  
16 When I got my first job after getting out of Stanford, it was at Stanford. I negotiated—this was  
17 50 years ago. The first thing I negotiated was I don't type. That was a big barrier. The next  
18 thing I negotiated for was a parking spot on the circle. Actually, businesses always are using  
19 parking as a perk within their company parking lots, and they can do it within town. It gets  
20 complicated to work out, but I think it would be kind of fun to work out. It would bring in



**COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE**  
**CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE**  
*DRAFT MINUTES*

1 people that we want to be residents or workers or part of our community. I guess that's really  
2 all I have to say, except that going back to the first element when you had the TMA and you  
3 designed the SOV and the share the ride things. I have not seen, within this group or anybody I  
4 know, anybody actually participating in it. I'd like to have a plan that we get going and be part  
5 of the plan and not just observers that this is a good thing for other people to do.

6 **Co-Chair Keller:** Thank you. Adrian.

7 **Adrian Fine:** Thank you. Just to start, I agree with many other folks here. This is a pretty good  
8 product; although, I think there is a bit of a lack of focus on affordable housing. Just putting it  
9 in the Comp Plan that we want affordable housing really isn't enough. Per Shani's comment,  
10 we actually need to identify funding sources, cross-subsidies and partnerships to get it done.  
11 This document doesn't do much in that regard. Given this land use chapter, we should also be  
12 looking at housing densities and parking requirements as they relate to the overall cost of  
13 housing. On the development requirements, I still have this question: why only new buildings?  
14 The greatest impact in terms of traffic and congestion and pollution, things like that, is from  
15 existing buildings and existing building users. Additional building will add marginal costs there,  
16 but we should consider ways to mitigate the impacts of existing buildings and users. I think  
17 Jason was speaking about this, that we've removed the ability, in the Comp Plan at least, to  
18 look at housing in places like Midtown, Stanford, some of our CN, CC, CS zones. That's kind of  
19 stringing our hands for the long term. I'm not sure we want to do that yet. I also think it's  
20 funny that we've removed a bunch of high quality design metrics and requirements for the



**COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE**  
**CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE**  
*DRAFT MINUTES*

1 hospital and employment centers. I wasn't really sure why that happened. I think we do want  
2 those to be pedestrian-friendly, bike-friendly places for all residents and workers. On the  
3 community indicators, I like that section, but I was wondering if there's a way to regionalize  
4 some of those measures. Maybe look at nearby cities and see what they do in terms of  
5 measuring them so that we can all kind of cross-evaluate projects. Recently we were looking at  
6 the Facebook project in Menlo Park, and it was kind of hard to compare it to what kind of  
7 impacts it would have in Palo Alto unless both cities are using the same metrics. I think that  
8 might be helpful. On the basement dewatering, I agree with everyone here. It's clearly an  
9 issue, but I think we should study it first before we make a broad decision here in the Comp  
10 Plan. It may be an item outside of the Comp Plan itself for Council to talk about. I think that's  
11 about it. Thank you all.

12 **Co-Chair Keller:** Thank you. A couple of things. With respect to school impacts, as Len  
13 mentioned, it says here on page 6 of the staff report, move policies related to planning for  
14 school impacts from the Community Services and Facilities Element to the Land Use Element. If  
15 we choose not to do this, does that mean it goes back into the Facilities Element? It was  
16 already taken out of that Community Services Element. You've got to put it somewhere. We  
17 have not as a body agreed to delete it, so it needs to be put somewhere. Since the element  
18 we're looking at is the Land Use Element, it must go there because we have not as a body  
19 decided to remove it. I haven't heard anybody saying remove it from the element at all. I think  
20 that's important. The next thing is that Fry's—with respect to coordinated area plan, Fry's may



**COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE**  
**CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE**  
*DRAFT MINUTES*

1 be moving in a few years. Therefore, we want to control that, so that should be a priority. We  
2 should also use that as a laboratory. If we could figure out how to do a coordinated area plan  
3 efficiently and effectively, we can think about how many more we do. In particular, South El  
4 Camino Real needs one, and that's important. The next thing is that in terms of what  
5 percentage of our land is housing, it's actually a false measure. That's because, firstly, R-2 and R  
6 MD are considered single-family residential when they're not. Secondly, things that are not  
7 considered multifamily residential is, for example, Arbor Real which is actually not zoned for  
8 housing. It's actually zoned for CS. We should revisit our land use map to reflect the actual  
9 uses. Thereby, we'll actually know how much of our land is actually multifamily residential. In  
10 addition, R-2 and R MD should be considered its own zoning of low-density residential. Then,  
11 we will not confuse that with single-family residential, because it's actually different. The next  
12 Housing Element is in 2022 and, therefore, we won't wait until 2030 to revisit our housing  
13 policies. I noticed that it was mentioned by Adrian Fine, and I've also mentioned it. He  
14 mentioned in the past the idea of value capture. I think we should value capture avoided  
15 parking and increased density, and the City should get the value from that that is given to  
16 developers for that increase. In particular, for the project at El Camino and Page Mill Road, if  
17 that value capture were allowed to be obtained, that could pay for a subsidized master lease  
18 which could be a mechanism for housing our City first responders and utility workers who need  
19 to be here in an event of an emergency. I hadn't heard anybody create a mechanism for that,





**COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE**  
**CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE**  
*DRAFT MINUTES*

1 but certainly value capture of that would be a way of doing that. I'm not sure if that can be  
2 done other than as a PC.

3 **Male:** (inaudible)

4 **Co-Chair Keller:** Thank you. The next thing is I think that the idea of accessible housing,  
5 accessibility, really refers to—that term seems to be used for handicapped, and that's not  
6 sufficiently broad in terms of what I would refer to as subsidized housing, which I think is the  
7 broadest term. We have about 2,500 units of subsidized housing in Palo Alto. Some of it is  
8 below market rate. Some of it is other kinds of subsidized housing. That's the term that's used  
9 in general for housing. I think that we should use that in general. When we mean BMR, that's  
10 specifically referred to, for example, increasing the percentage from 15 percent which most of  
11 our developments are for-purchase housing, maybe increasing that to 25 over time. We're  
12 thinking about how to do that. I think that makes sense. In terms of indicators, I'm in favor of  
13 Option 2. Also, I'm intrigued by Shani's comment about not having indicators in there. I do  
14 think we should do measurements. I'd like to actually have in here where the sources of this  
15 data are. If we don't have the data, we're not going to be able to measure anything. Also, in  
16 terms of development requirements, how can you have a development requirement, Number  
17 8, that is encourage something or facilitate something or minimize—I guess minimize is  
18 something. Facilitate and encourage don't sound like requirements to me. I have a little bit of  
19 trouble with that. In terms of livability, I think that's a perfectly good term. We somehow got  
20 allergic to the term quality of life, which some of us like. Now, if we're going to ban livability, I



**COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE**  
**CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE**  
*DRAFT MINUTES*

1 think that's a problem. Let me close on the issue of dewatering. There are lots of levels of  
2 aquifer. By the way, I serve on the Environmental and Water Resources Committee for the  
3 Santa Clara Valley Water District. I think I know a little about this, but not as much as the  
4 people who have been studying it a lot. There are different levels of the aquifer. It turns out  
5 that Santa Clara Valley Water District charges us for the State Water Project, of which we  
6 receive no value. Some of that money is actually used in other areas to fund recharge zones, so  
7 that surface water actually recharges the shallow aquifer which in turn recharges the deep  
8 aquifer. We have no recharge zones in Palo Alto. One of the things is if you deplete the  
9 shallow aquifer, not only are you removing water that is watering trees, because trees do have  
10 their roots go down and some shrubs do, but you're also eliminating water that would recharge  
11 the deep aquifer. When you don't recharge the deep aquifer, then you can result in  
12 subsidence. We do have emergency wells. If we were to draw on those, we could have more  
13 subsidence. We did, as mentioned, have subsidence in the past. It is about 5 minutes after  
14 7:00 approximately. I think we have a little bit more time to go around for people who raised.  
15 If you could capture the names as they appear. We'll continue on. This time we'll take 1 1/2  
16 minutes, if we can, so we have enough time. We have about a half hour, and we'll go on from  
17 there. I think that, Shani, you were next.

18 **Shani Kleinhaus:** Thank you. I wanted to explain why I among others thought that Charleston  
19 Center is not good for housing. It's not because I don't think housing is needed. That specific  
20 site, I think, the parking there will eventually make room for more retail and services. Right



**COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE**  
**CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE**  
*DRAFT MINUTES*

1 next door in Mountain View, there are going to be 10,000 units in North Bayshore. There is no  
2 services in North Bayshore. One of the closest areas to North Bayshore is Charleston Center. I  
3 expect that area will need to grow, and it will need to grow up and it will need to grow wide.  
4 That parking area will be needed for retail and services, so I don't think housing belongs there,  
5 because you can't move people from their homes. If there's a business that doesn't—you can  
6 always have more businesses. People need tutoring and they need dentists and they need  
7 shops, and that's where they'll go. That's why; it's not because housing is not needed. I just  
8 wanted to respond to you on that. I'm not going to go through all of these. I already  
9 commented on some of the things. Policy L-1.3, promote infill development in urban service  
10 area, is compatible with the surrounding is okay. It says and the (inaudible) scale and character  
11 of the City. That does not mean anything, because in south Palo Alto, you don't want to build  
12 something that is compatible with the character of California Avenue or Downtown. I think that  
13 should be modified.

14 **Co-Chair Keller:** Thank you. Next is Alex.

15 **Alex van Riesen:** I wanted to come back to the coordinated area plans for a minute. It seems  
16 like we talk about Downtown and Cal. Ave. as the only ones that are on the transportation  
17 corridor. I would argue, with regard to the Fry's site, whether we have the Fry's site by itself or  
18 put in with Cal. Ave., that is also on the corridor. The distance from the Cal. Ave. station to Fry's  
19 is nominal. I think that would make it, because of its current turnover that's going to occur and  
20 that size, probably the primary place for development. That was my suggestion.



**COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE**  
**CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE**  
*DRAFT MINUTES*

1 **Co-Chair Keller:** Thank you. Next is Doria. If you could put down your name tag after you  
2 finish speaking, that would be helpful.

3 **Doria Summa:** Thanks. I wanted to agree with a lot of the concerns that I've heard. I, first of  
4 all, want to encourage everybody to allow Shani's option of caps to be presented to Council. I  
5 think it won't take work to do it. I think it's a very interesting one. I'm in favor of that. I  
6 noticed also that we couldn't use quality of life because people didn't like that term and  
7 livability we can't use. I don't know what we're going—I agree with Author. I don't know what  
8 term we can use to replace those. We need something to capture that feeling of how people  
9 are experiencing their life in Palo Alto. I don't have a problem at all with designating sites at  
10 this time that are not appropriate for housing. I think it's perfectly appropriate to choose uses  
11 where you want them. I'm really concerned that Palo Alto, as long as it can, maintains walkable  
12 neighborhood centers, so people don't have to get into cars and drive places to get everything  
13 they need. That includes having it delivered by UPS or FedEx, because those trucks are just  
14 increasing daily, and it's really a nuisance. Walking is really healthy. I also agree that the way  
15 the City measures the residential zones is a little bit misleading, and we could improve so  
16 people would have a better understanding. I really want to put a plug in for Shani's idea,  
17 because I think it's a really good one. Thanks.

18 **Co-Chair Keller:** Thank you. Next is Annette.

19 **Annette Glanckopf:** A couple of fast points. I want to get back to affordable housing for first  
20 responders and school teachers. I don't know if that's an urban myth or not. Talking to a lot of



**COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE**  
**CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE**  
*DRAFT MINUTES*

1 firefighters, especially if you look at their schedules, they don't really want to live in cramped  
2 apartments. I have not talked to anyone, even the younger ones, that really want to live in an  
3 apartment. I think before we really get off on this track, we really need to do a little bit more  
4 work. Another point, I'd like to see Cubberley more prominently mentioned in the Land Use as  
5 far as active words. I agree with Arthur. There's a lot of very weak terminology in here, not  
6 direct and a lot of fluffy adjectives. I'd like to see something about implementing the Cubberley  
7 plan. I think dewatering is absolutely critical. What is in the Land Use is not very strong. It's  
8 sort of high level. I think all of the heavy duty stuff should probably be in the Natural  
9 Environment or the Safety Element, so I've not had my comments. I'll save my comments  
10 there. As far as Midtown Center, I think it has a lot of the same characteristics as what was  
11 described for Charleston. There is a real concern about loss of retail. The whole Midtown  
12 Residents' Association, which is about 10,000, people, was formed on walkable retail. We keep  
13 losing, losing, losing retail. If any part of those sites are developed, we're going to lose all these  
14 mom and pop stores to larger, branded firms. That does concern me.

15 **Co-Chair Keller:** Thank you. Mark.

16 **Mark Nadim:** A quick comment about the Charleston Center and Midtown Center. Actually, I  
17 think those are best models for mixed-use development, where you have upper floors that are  
18 all residential and the bottom floor is all retail. What Annette just mentioned, that the small  
19 retail would be lost with new development, the mom and pop shops, that can be done as a



**COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE**  
**CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE**  
*DRAFT MINUTES*

1 requirement or a contingency on the developer to rent—after the development to have the  
2 same mom and pop shops come back into that center. I think that's a doable thing. Thank you.

3 **Co-Chair Keller:** Thank you. Next is Elaine.

4 **Elaine Uang:** Just a couple of points. On urban forest measures for Table L-2, urban tree  
5 canopy cover, I think the Urban Forest Master Plan is going to be pushing forward a percentage  
6 of City covered by trees, and it's about 40 percent over 10 years. The recommended frequency,  
7 I think from speaking with Canopy folks, is actually every 5 years because I know that there is  
8 some short staffing to do that. It's actually pretty difficult to take that measure, so every 4  
9 years is a little bit too frequent. I wanted to just go back to housing and retail. I actually agree  
10 with Mark that some of these places are actually great mixed-use opportunities. They can  
11 provide that walkability, and it provides a built-in customer base. We talk a lot about retail, but  
12 we're also not recognizing that retail in order to survive in this day and age of online shopping  
13 needs people and people close by to frequent those places. Housing with respect to zoning, I  
14 actually want to call out that a lot of places in our community—what a parcel is zoned for is not  
15 necessarily reflective of what's there. I think case in point is College Terrace area where there  
16 are a lot of small bungalows on 3,000-square-foot lots, some of which may have been  
17 consolidated into single-family residential parcels. It makes it harder for anybody who comes  
18 along with those parcels to—they're existing, nonconforming, which means that it's kind of  
19 technically illegal to rebuild those again. There is a potential for losing housing stock because  
20 what you can build legally new doesn't reflect what is actually there. Downtown there's



**COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE**  
**CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE**  
*DRAFT MINUTES*

1 actually a couple of these where there may have small, three-unit multifamily that technically  
2 doesn't conform with the zoning that exists right now. I think as a starting point our land use  
3 map should reflect what is on the ground, not just what was arbitrarily assigned to it in the '70s.

4 **Co-Chair Keller:** Next is Bonnie.

5 **Bonnie Packer:** If Shani is recommending an arbitrary cap without means for evaluating it, I  
6 don't think that's a good idea. I think what we have now in the Comp Plan, which gives people  
7 a chance to look and see if the cap is really what's still needed when things have changed, then  
8 that's a better way to go. I agree with what Mark and Elaine just said about mixed use in these  
9 neighborhood shopping centers. That may be something that we might want to see in 5, 10  
10 years. The other thing about the school impacts, Arthur you said nobody said to eliminate it. I  
11 understand that we should be aware of what is happening in the School District and we work  
12 with them, but we both also understand that there are legal limitations to how that's  
13 expressed. If that is in the Comp Plan, it should be expressed within the context of the State  
14 requirements about school impacts, how you use that information and whether you use it to  
15 limit development. The other thing about housing for specific groups of people are laws about  
16 fair housing don't allow you to exclude or have housing for just specific groups of people,  
17 except for some exceptions like seniors and veterans in certain places. While theoretically it's a  
18 good idea, it only works if other things happen like the School District owns the land and they  
19 can have it for housing for teachers, but not otherwise. We just have to be aware of that.



**COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE**  
**CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE**  
*DRAFT MINUTES*

1 **Co-Chair Keller:** Thank you. I think the old policy did not refer to particular developments. It  
2 referred to changes in policies and zoning. I think that is within State law as I understand it, and  
3 I think you would agree. The second thing is with respect to Midtown and Charleston. We saw  
4 what happened when Alma Plaza was redeveloped into Alma Village. The reason it's called  
5 village is because it's mostly housing and a mere shadow of itself in terms of retail. We see  
6 what happened with the College Terrace Center where we were promised that JJ&F would stay,  
7 and that just isn't going to happen. On the idea that we would redevelop and allow an existing  
8 retailer to go away and somehow come back in 2 years after the thing is redeveloped, how is  
9 that retailer going to continue to live, continue to operate, continue to pay their employees?  
10 They're not going to continue to exist. It's going to be replaced by something else at a higher  
11 price and gentrified. That's typically what's happened in the redevelopment. I think that in  
12 terms of the mix in Midtown and Charleston Center, that is very delicate and needs to be  
13 retained. I think that—there's no more comments. Next we will go with next round with  
14 Whitney.

15 **Whiney McNair:** Thank you. I just had a couple of additional comments. Number 2 in the staff  
16 report talked about having a definitive statement, the net loss of retail uses should not be  
17 allowed. I would just caution putting in really definitive statements like that. Cupertino is  
18 struggling with that with the Vallco Shopping Center right now. There's a mandate to keep the  
19 amount of retail that's there, and it's a failing shopping center where retail may be more  
20 appropriate in a smaller building or the footprint's smaller or the type of retail may change over





**COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE**  
**CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE**  
*DRAFT MINUTES*

1 time. Mandating a specific square footage doesn't allow for any flexibility. I'd just caution  
2 putting in statements like that. It's the same as with no prohibition on office uses in mixed use.  
3 It doesn't allow for any flexibility. Lastly, I think there's some idea floating around that we  
4 would just go forward with a straight cap without any ability to look at it over time. Again, I'm  
5 not sure what that is, but I just want to make sure that before anything goes forward, because  
6 I'm not allowed to vote on it, that we understand what that is and the group talks about it and  
7 makes sure what that is. Thanks.

8 **Co-Chair Keller:** Thank you. I think that, Jennifer, you haven't spoken yet in this round.

9 **Jennifer Hetterly:** I just wanted to call out a couple of the items in the outstanding issues. I  
10 absolutely believe that the school impacts piece belongs in Land Use and not Community  
11 Services and Facilities. Those impacts come from development, and Community Facilities and  
12 Services is not about housing or population growth. I also support Number 11, which is add a  
13 new policy requiring a conditional use permit for any new or expanded private school. I'm also  
14 concerned that private schools may be incorporated in Policy L-1.2 about the cap exemptions  
15 under institutional use. I'd like some clarification of that, whether private schools are  
16 considered institutional use in that exemption. Also, Number 1, I do not believe that hotels  
17 should be adjacent to single-family neighborhoods.

18 **Co-Chair Keller:** Thank you. Everybody has spoken at least once, so Shani is next.

19 **Shani Kleinhaus:** I think I need to clarify what I meant. I think we do need to have the  
20 community indicators and measure what's going on in the community, but the requirements—



**COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE**  
**CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE**  
*DRAFT MINUTES*

1 I'm worried about them replacing our ability to provide input with standards that just get a  
2 check. I do think that we need to have the community indicators, but I think if we should be  
3 able to do caps only plus those indicators without the requirements. There's a lot of  
4 requirements already in the Green Building Code, and those should continue and the Green  
5 Building Code get updated every 3 years and things could be added. That's about that. I have a  
6 couple of more—I hope some of you would be willing to forward that. Doria is. If maybe  
7 there's a couple more, then maybe that will go forward. Maybe I can write and explain it a little  
8 better later. I'm worried about Policy L-77 or it's L-134 on page L-767, streamline to the  
9 maximum extent feasible any future processes for design and review of historic structure to  
10 eliminate unnecessary delay and uncertainty for the applicant. I don't believe in that. I think  
11 we don't need to eliminate uncertainty for the applicants, because that's what it's all about.  
12 There should be uncertainty for the applicants if they're going to destroy a beautiful, ancient  
13 building. I think that I would like to see that changed. The mature oaks are part of our history  
14 and should not be removed. That's on the same page. One last one. L-177 on Page L-87 is  
15 including too many things that don't belong together very well. It needs some work.

16 **Co-Chair Keller:** Thank you. Next we have Bonnie. I think everybody else has spoken.  
17 Everybody has spoken. At this point in time, I will entertain a motion. The motion I'd love to  
18 have—I'm not allowed to make a motion as Chair, but I can suggest a motion, which somebody  
19 else can make. The motion I'd like to have is to forward to the City Council the current draft of  
20 the—Annette, did you want to say something first?



**COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE**  
**CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE**  
*DRAFT MINUTES*

1 **Annette Glanckopf:** Have a question. I'd be happy to make the motion after this. We've talked  
2 about a lot of things today. I don't know—there's a lot of bits and pieces that some of us have  
3 turned in. I just wonder if that's going to be incorporated or if it's just going to be the draft as it  
4 is.

5 **Co-Chair Keller:** That will—hear my motion. Hear my suggestion for the motion that you're  
6 going to make. The motion that I'm entertaining, that I'm requesting is a motion that we  
7 forward the current draft of the Land Use and Community Design Element to the City Council  
8 along with the minutes of today's meeting, the verbatim minutes of today's meeting, all of the  
9 documents that are submitted at places in today's meeting and any documents forwarded to  
10 staff by a week from today, September 27th at 5:00 p.m.

11 **Annette Glanckopf:** I'm not sure there's enough time for them to read all this stuff, unless  
12 that's the entire agenda of the City Council meeting. I'm happy to make the motion as said.

13 **Doria Summa:** Second.

14 **Co-Chair Keller:** We have a motion on the floor by Annette Glanckopf, with a second by Doria.  
15 Does anybody wish to speak to the motion? I guess put up your name tags. I think Shani is  
16 first.

17 **Shani Kleinhaus:** I would like ...

18 **Co-Chair Keller:** Wait a second. I think the maker and the seconder by policy get to speak first  
19 to any motion. Annette, do you want to say anything first?



**COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE  
CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
DRAFT MINUTES**

1 **Annette Glanckopf:** Just that I think there is a sense of urgency. As you said, the enemy of the  
2 best is the enemy of good or something like that. I do think we need to move ahead. I am  
3 concerned with the volume of material. I don't think we should turn in—my own feeling is I  
4 don't think we should turn in the marked up copy as well as the other one. It just gets so  
5 confusing. They probably have the original Comp Plan, and they can go back to it. I'm just  
6 concerned with this vast amount of material, that they have plenty of time to get all of the  
7 documents.

8 **Co-Chair Keller:** Hillary, would you like to talk about the draft? I think they'll give the current  
9 version and the difference from the original version or something like that. I think that's what  
10 you did for Transportation.

11 **Hillary Gitelman:** We're going to have to look at that. It's maybe that we've made so many  
12 changes it'll be hard to reflect the difference from the original. We'll definitely give them a  
13 clean copy and transmit all of the comments that we heard this evening and that we get in  
14 writing.

15 **Co-Chair Keller:** Thank you. Doria, do you want to say anything?

16 **Doria Summa:** Yes. I think that it makes sense to get this to Council for their first pass at it. I  
17 don't think it's perfect, and I think there's a lot of little details that we haven't addressed. That  
18 being said, I don't think this group is likely to come to any more consensus about the big issues,  
19 so I think it's just best to move it along to Council with the choices. I would wish, if it's possible



**COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE**  
**CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE**  
*DRAFT MINUTES*

1 with scheduling, we could have more than just a week to get our final comments in, but I don't  
2 know if that's possible. I think it's good for the Council to review it at this time.

3 **Co-Chair Keller:** Thank you. Shani.

4 **Shani Kleinhaus:** Can I make a friendly amendment to add an option of caps only and  
5 community measures, so no standards?

6 **Co-Chair Keller:** I think you mean caps only, not the development requirements ...

7 **Shani Kleinhaus:** No development requirements.

8 **Co-Chair Keller:** ... but still have the community indicators.

9 **Shani Kleinhaus:** But still have the community measurements.

10 **Annette Glanckopf:** As maker of the motion, I accept that.

11 **Co-Chair Keller:** As one of the options to be included to the Council?

12 **Doria Summa:** I agree to accept that.

13 **Co-Chair Keller:** Don, I think you're next. Microphone please.

14 **Don McDougall:** I would suggest it's a good idea to include the written input along with this. I  
15 think the transcript of the evening is not going to necessarily help, and it's an extra burden. I  
16 would trust the staff, who we have all complimented tonight, would take the essence of what's  
17 been said and help us with that.

18 **Co-Chair Keller:** I think that we are including the written input. The motion includes the  
19 written input to today's meeting at places as well as the materials that will be received in the  
20 week. Anybody else? I'll let staff ...



**COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE**  
**CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE**  
*DRAFT MINUTES*

1 **Female:** (inaudible)

2 **Co-Chair Keller:** Hamilton, sorry.

3 **Hamilton Hitchings:** Thanks. I was at the City Council. There weren't a lot of CAC members,  
4 but some were there last night. I think you're underestimating the significance of the changes  
5 that Council provides. The stuff we're talking about is relatively minor to something like Tom  
6 DuBois' comment that we should only have half the programs in the Transportation Element  
7 that we do now. If we're sort of nitpicking on this stuff and they come back with significant  
8 changes, it's really counterproductive for us to withhold that from them for significant  
9 direction. I think it's in good enough shape for them to be able to provide the high-level  
10 feedback that we need so we can continue to move forward with this, rather than just go  
11 around in circles. I think providing our comments, if we have differences from what's in the  
12 draft, will be sufficient, which is why I'm going to vote for the motion.

13 **Co-Chair Keller:** Thank you. I'm going to make a comment. Last time when this came last  
14 night, it was supposed to come to the Council about 9:15 in the evening after a bunch of long  
15 agenda items. Considering that the Council seems to want to deal with the Transportation  
16 Element and the Land Use Element together, my recommendation is that you deal with the  
17 Land Use Element first as the only agenda item on the meeting, and then you bring up the  
18 Transportation Element afterwards for them to make additional comments related to that  
19 together, and that you devote a single Council meeting to both items, and that you start  
20 promptly at 6:00, no Study Sessions, just the typical Consent Items. That will give the Council



**COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE  
CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
DRAFT MINUTES**

1 enough time to really devote time to it and allow the community to participate effectively in  
2 that process. That's just a recommendation. That's not part of the motion. With that, any—  
3 you have a question, Shani? Cue the microphone please.

4 **Shani Kleinhaus:** Is Council going to get just the transcript or are you going to summarize it for  
5 them?

6 **Female:** They'll get (inaudible).

7 **Elaine Costello:** We will do a staff report.

8 **Shani Kleinhaus:** All these comments will be kind of condensed and given as to ...

9 **Elaine Costello:** Really condensed with the major issues. I think a lot of the issues that—a lot  
10 of the comments tonight were around the five major issues, and then there were some other  
11 major issues. We will summarize those, and they will get all the other comments.

12 **Shani Kleinhaus:** How are they going to comment—like what I said about the architectural,  
13 how does that move forward? That's a very small thing. Do they have to read the entire  
14 transcript to see that?

15 **Elaine Costello:** We haven't figured out how every individual comment is going to get  
16 transmitted. What we have tried to do—we probably will just run a long list like we did with  
17 the 15. We might make it 30 or something. I think we are going to try and focus them in on  
18 what were the major issues that were discussed tonight, which were very similar to things that  
19 have gone on throughout the entire discussion. They will get all the wording changes.



**COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE  
CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
DRAFT MINUTES**

1 **Co-Chair Keller:** Maybe this is an opportunity for staff to comment on the request that we have  
2 more than 1 week for comments. I'll let staff weigh in on that.

3 **Elaine Costello:** It's just we have a pretty ...

4 **Co-Chair Keller:** Are you on microphone?

5 **Elaine Costello:** I am on the microphone. Of course, if the group wants more than a week—let  
6 me see. We really do need to get them in a week, because we sat down this afternoon for a  
7 long time trying to lay out what's going to happen to get this to the Council. Really you need to  
8 get it to them a month before, so we do need it in a week. If it's going to get included. We  
9 want to be able to include it.

10 **Co-Chair Keller:** I also realized that if staff is going to be assembling it in some useful way,  
11 that's going to take them time. Any other comments? Don, you're next.

12 **Don McDougall:** Just clarification. Number 1, I want to make sure everybody knows I was at  
13 the Council meeting last night too, since everybody else is taking credit for that. Can we get  
14 clarification of the motion? I think we agreed that we're going to submit as-is with written  
15 comments. Are we including the transcript from tonight or are we trusting staff to consolidate  
16 tonight?

17 **Elaine Costello:** We will always include the transcript from the CAC.

18 **Don McDougall:** Thank you.

19 **Elaine Costello:** There'll be the transcript. There'll be a summary, and there'll be all the written  
20 comments.





**COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE  
CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
DRAFT MINUTES**

1 **Don McDougall:** Thank you.

2 **Co-Chair Keller:** The written comments received at the meeting today as well as the written  
3 comments received by a week from today. Bonnie.

4 **Bonnie Packer:** I'd just like to be sure that Council understands that when we have our—it's  
5 not really a discussion. We have everybody presenting an idea. The way it's set up and  
6 understandably we don't have the opportunity to say, "That's an interesting idea, but did you  
7 think of that?" A lot of ideas that were presented tonight, I didn't choose to say maybe, maybe  
8 not. Just because somebody said something, it doesn't mean that is the sense of the whole  
9 group. We each are saying our individual things. We're each individuals. We come at this from  
10 our varying perspectives, which is good. They just have to understand that one person's idea  
11 isn't the idea of the whole committee. We don't have the opportunity to find out whether it is,  
12 because it could very well be or not. We don't know.

13 **Co-Chair Keller:** I appreciate that. I think that's well said. I also want to say that hopefully at  
14 this meeting, I think it will be November 14th, is that right?

15 **Elaine Costello:** No.

16 **Co-Chair Keller:** No.

17 **Hillary Gitelman:** We're still futzing with the dates partly because of your observation that the  
18 Council agendas are too full. I wanted to just follow on Bonnie and say that your observation is  
19 absolutely correct. I think that one of the good things about getting this element to them is  
20 that you've articulated with the subcommittee's help all these options. It's going to be clear to



**COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE  
CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
DRAFT MINUTES**

1 the Council that this is not a consensus document. The consensus is there's a lot of options  
2 here. With your transcript comments and your written comments, I think they'll get the full  
3 scope of this.

4 **Co-Chair Keller:** I look forward to the Council weighing in on what they think are among the  
5 choices and how that moves forward. Is there anybody else or can I call the motion? All in  
6 favor of the motion, raise your hand please and if you're a voting member. All opposed to the  
7 motion. No people opposed to the motion? All abstaining. We have one abstention. That  
8 motion passes. Thank you very much. Let's take a moment to just stretch and sit down. Don't  
9 take too long. Then, we'll start on the Natural Environment Element. Thank you.

- 10 **2. Discussion: Natural Environment Element**
- 11 **a. Introduction of Natural Environment**
- 12 **b. Report from Natural Environment and Sustainability Subcommittees**
- 13 **c. Discussion of Draft Element**

14 **Co-Chair Keller:** We have about 50 minutes left to our meeting. Will staff please start with the  
15 introduction to the Natural Environment Element?

16 **Elaine Costello:** I'm just going to let Joanna get started and kind of give you an up ...

17 **Joanna Jansen:** Thank you very much, Elaine and Arthur. Tonight is your first meeting as a full  
18 CAC on a new element, the Natural Environment Element. I know that a lot of you have been  
19 looking forward to this one for a long time, and we're excited to kick it off tonight. This is the  
20 first meeting, and we have three more CAC meetings scheduled on this. Each month from now  
21 to the end of the year, October, November and December, we're going to be looking at this  
22 element. As Elaine said, we spent some time on the schedule this afternoon. We'll also be



**COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE**  
**CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE**  
*DRAFT MINUTES*

1 looking at the Safety Element at those three meetings as well. Natural Environment is moving  
2 forward a little bit ahead of Safety. What you have right now is a rough draft. We have had  
3 one subcommittee meeting on this element, back at the last week of August. The next task that  
4 we're going to do after tonight, when we get your input and before the next subcommittee  
5 meeting, which is coming up in early October, is sharpen and focus the element. So far, after  
6 last night with the Transportation Element and the Council's previous review of the Community  
7 Services Element, we're really hearing pretty consistently from them that they want to see  
8 things that are concise, well organized, sharp. We are going to take that to heart and try to do  
9 a better job as staff and the consultant team of kind of presenting you as the CAC and as the  
10 subcommittee with something that reflects what we're hearing from Council, so that we can  
11 get something back to them that reflects their feedback. One of the things that the  
12 subcommittee looked at was the organization of the element. The organization merits a little  
13 bit of discussion here, because this is one element where the Council motion from back in  
14 December on this element is to split this current element into two elements. We would retain  
15 a Natural Environment Element. The Council had some direction about adding goals to that  
16 element, including a new goal about climate change and adaptation. The Council also wanted  
17 to split Natural Environment into Safety and move the topics of hazardous waste, solid waste,  
18 natural hazards and then a new topic of community safety and emergency management to a  
19 new Safety Element. Given that pretty fundamental Council direction on the contents of this  
20 element and of the new Safety Element, we wanted to spend some time with the



**COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE**  
**CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE**  
*DRAFT MINUTES*

1 subcommittee and then tonight with you, going over different possible organization. You had  
2 in your packet—I think it was Attachment J in this kind of large, 11x17. Tonight you probably  
3 realize that you got—there's a new version of this at places or over on the countertop there.  
4 We found a mistake in the one that was in your packet where the climate change was  
5 mistakenly shown as part of the Safety Element. That was not correct. The Council motion  
6 would have retained that in the Natural Environment Element. We've updated this  
7 organization and then also the recommendation column to show climate change as part of  
8 Natural Environment rather than as part of Safety. Again, all of this organization is part of what  
9 we're here to talk about tonight. You can see one set of recommendations from the  
10 subcommittee meeting discussions in the column that's called Subcommittee A. Ideas of  
11 adding understory to the urban forest section, a new section on light pollution was suggested at  
12 the subcommittee meeting. Changing terminology from hazardous waste to hazardous  
13 materials in the Safety Element. We also received some written comments from a  
14 subcommittee member that had a little bit more of a reconceptualization of the element into  
15 these categories of land, water and air with some additional categories as well for topics that  
16 don't fall into those three major ways of thinking about the natural environment. I think we as  
17 staff and the consultants were interested in exploring whether or not that land, water and air  
18 theme could be carried forward. You see that in the recommendation column as well as  
19 retaining the other categories of noise, energy, the new category of light pollution and climate  
20 change. This table is just an attempt to show you a comparison of the current organization as



**COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE**  
**CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE**  
*DRAFT MINUTES*

1 well as a couple of different organizations that have been suggested since the PTC and the  
2 Council started their discussions of this element. I think maybe it would be a useful thing for us  
3 to spend some time on tonight. Before we get into that, I also just wanted to make sure we've  
4 had a chance to give you a brief overview of the major topics that the subcommittee brought  
5 up. Those are on pages 8, 9, 10 and 11 and 12 of your staff report. I'm not going to list all of  
6 those right now, because I do want to leave the majority of the time for your discussion. One  
7 comment just to make is that Natural Environment, I think, and particularly when we think  
8 about a new topic of climate change and adaptation is one of many topics in the Comp Plan  
9 where we want to make sure that we're seeing integration and consistency with the S/CAP.  
10 Just to reiterate the point from your staff report that specific S/CAP strategies from the draft  
11 S/CAP have been integrated into the policy framework that's before you tonight. That's one of  
12 several types of changes that we went ahead and made to try to move this element forward  
13 before you tackle it, so that you're not feeling you have to start from scratch. Of course, there's  
14 many further changes that remain to be made and that's what we want to start with tonight.

15 **Annette Glanckopf:** I'm really confused. Maybe I could just cut to the chase and ask you, since  
16 we have this whole packet, can you just fold this in half and say everything from the natural  
17 hazards down is going to be in another chapter?

18 **Joanna Jansen:** Climate change is below natural hazards. At least based on the initial Council  
19 motion, that would remain part of Natural Environment. You could fold ...

20 **Annette Glanckopf:** You can just (crosstalk) this and we're not going to talk about this tonight?



**COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE  
CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
DRAFT MINUTES**

1 **Joanna Jansen:** The only comment I would make is that the subcommittee did have a different  
2 idea about solid waste. They saw solid waste as a part of Natural Environment rather than a  
3 part of the Safety Element. You may see some topics down on the lower half of the table that  
4 some folks might feel should be part of Natural Environment rather than Safety. Other than  
5 that, you really would focus on what's in the upper half or two-thirds of the table.

6 **Co-Chair Keller:** Lisa, you have a question?

7 **Lisa Peschcke-Koedt:** I'm sorry. Just a question of the original open space, I think, also included  
8 parks or did it not? It may be my memory. It was sort of in Land Use and it was sort of in the  
9 Natural ...

10 **Joanna Jansen:** I think parks are primarily in Community Services and Facilities.

11 **Lisa Peschcke-Koedt:** In Community Services only.

12 **Joanna Jansen:** Open space here is more like your ...

13 **Lisa Peschcke-Koedt:** Like the Bay stuff. Thank you.

14 **Joanna Jansen:** ... wild, open space areas in the Bay and Foothills.

15 **Lisa Peschcke-Koedt:** It's not taking anything out. It just was never in the definition of open  
16 space.

17 **Joanna Jansen:** We have changed the content of the open space category.

18 **Co-Chair Keller:** If you want to speak, please put up your tag. Hamilton.

19 **Hamilton Hitchings:** What is the difference between Subcommittee A, Subcommittee B?



**COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE  
CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
DRAFT MINUTES**

1 **Joanna Jansen:** Subcommittee A was the kind of verbal discussion that we had during the  
2 subcommittee meeting. Subcommittee B is written comments that ...

3 **Hamilton Hitchings:** You keep referring to the subcommittee meeting. Apparently it's not  
4 either the natural environment subcommittee nor the safety subcommittee. What  
5 subcommittee is it?

6 **Joanna Jansen:** It was a meeting of the natural environment subcommittee and the  
7 sustainability subcommittee on August 30th.

8 **Elaine Costello:** We did get written comments from a member of the sustainability  
9 subcommittee who could not attend that day about a suggested organization. We thought  
10 there were some value in that, so we just showed it on the chart.

11 **Female:** That's B.

12 **Elaine Costello:** That's B, right.

13 **Female:** (inaudible)

14 **Joanna Jansen:** Yes.

15 **Elaine Costello:** Because we ended—because (inaudible). Yeah.

16 **Co-Chair Keller:** Just to get that in the record. Subcommittee B is an alternative from a  
17 member of the subcommittee. Just as a clarification, what we're doing is—Sorry. That doesn't  
18 even get on the record either. The issue is that the Subcommittee B recommendation is a  
19 recommendation from one of the members of the subcommittee. The way we're doing this is  
20 that the sustainability committee is meeting with the element committee the first time that the



**COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE  
CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
DRAFT MINUTES**

1 element committee meets before the CAC meets. There was a meeting of the natural  
2 environment subcommittee with the sustainability subcommittee that one time. The next time  
3 the natural environment subcommittee will meet by itself without the sustainability  
4 committee. The future meetings that happen will be the natural environment committee  
5 alone. However, the sustainability committee will meet with the safety subcommittee once  
6 before we as the CAC see the Safety Element. After we see the Safety Element, then the safety  
7 committee will meet without the sustainability committee. I hope that's clear as mud or at  
8 least a little better. I'm just trying to clarify that the sustainability committee is meeting once  
9 with each element before we see it as a CAC. Do you want to ...

10 **Elaine Costello:** No, we had a number. We have Bonnie ...

11 **Co-Chair Keller:** Bonnie, go ahead.

12 **Elaine Costello:** ... and we have Don and we have Shani.

13 **Bonnie Parker:** I'm just observing from the committee list that the people—the same people  
14 are on the sustainability committee as are on the natural environment committee. That's just  
15 an observation. Is this the time for me to make just a couple of suggested organizational  
16 changes?

17 **Co-Chair Keller:** Actually is staff finished with their report?

18 **Joanna Jansen:** I can be.

19 **Co-Chair Keller:** If you have any clarifying questions, that's fine. Otherwise, why don't we let  
20 staff finish? Then what we can do—this is really clarifying questions that people had. What we





**COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE  
CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
DRAFT MINUTES**

1 also want to do is go with the process that we have of starting with the subcommittees first to  
2 speak. We'll do that. Maybe continue. Anybody have a burning, quick question? Don, did you  
3 have a burning, quick question?

4 **Don McDougall:** I'll wait (inaudible) 'til you do the subcommittee.

5 **Co-Chair Keller:** Thank you. Go ahead. You want to finish?

6 **Joanna Jansen:** I think I'm finished.

7 **Co-Chair Keller:** If you are on the natural environment subcommittee or you're on the  
8 sustainability subcommittee, then you raise your tent and then we'll call on you. That's all.  
9 Let's start with Don. You go first.

10 **Don McDougall:** Partly to Hillary. One of the things that Council continually says is that the  
11 preamble is too long. It was commented last night that there was 26 pages here or whatever. I  
12 would note that 14 of those pages are maps and definitions. You could put those in an  
13 appendix or somewhere else as opposed to in the preamble, and then your preamble would be  
14 a lot shorter. In the preamble, we have land use definitions, publicly owned conservation lands,  
15 public parks and whatever. When we get to this, I'd like to defend the Subcommittee B thing.  
16 It's Subcommittee A with just a little better organization so we understand what the  
17 components are. I would suggest that instead of Foothills and Bay, maybe we should be  
18 referring to the publicly owned conservation land to be consistent with the definitions that  
19 we've created. Under Subcommittee B, I don't think the climate change and climate adaptation



**COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE**  
**CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE**  
*DRAFT MINUTES*

1 box should be left empty. That should continue to be a separate box, I believe. Neither should  
2 energy or light pollution be left out.

3 **Co-Chair Keller:** Thank you. Shani. Microphone.

4 **Shani Kleinhaus:** I usually speak too loud. I think that urban parks, there are policies now that  
5 talk about the urban parks as a continuation of the natural experience for people. I don't want  
6 to see urban parks left out of the natural environment. I'm looking at your recommendation,  
7 because I think it's a pretty good representation of the other various things here. Soil is  
8 missing. Soil is a big thing. We see people putting dyed mulch that poisons the soil. We see  
9 people putting those (inaudible) under the plastic turf. That kills the soil. We see salinization  
10 due to irrigation with recycled water. We need to think about how to solve that problem in a  
11 more comprehensive way and not poison our soil. Soil is something we kind of think of as dirt,  
12 but it's really something we all need. I would like to see that somewhere in the parks. I think  
13 under risk and safety—I'm not sure how to do this. Water supply should be in there, because  
14 we don't know that we'll always have Hetch Hetchy water. I know that we already deal with  
15 this to some extent, so maybe that's something that we should have. Another hazard that we  
16 kind of don't think about but has been quite a problem for Palo Alto is the trains and what  
17 people use them for. I don't know if we want to say something about the trains being a hazard.  
18 Maybe it's not a natural hazard, but still. The last thing is about solid waste. There is a  
19 comment in here that solid waste was not commented on as an issue. What we see these days  
20 is that the value of recyclables is going down, and it's very hard to sell them to China now. I just



**COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE  
CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
DRAFT MINUTES**

1 do it very, very quick, googling on how many fires at recycling plants in California happened in  
2 the last few months. I counted four, one in San Jose, one in San Carlos, one in Maywood which  
3 is (inaudible), one in Newark which was huge. This is all just this year. Then, there was another  
4 one in Arizona. What happens to that is we send all this recycling material with a lot of good  
5 will and they don't have anything to do with that. Accidental fires happen. I can't blame  
6 anyone. I don't know that anybody actually ignited those, but this seems to be a huge increase  
7 from what happened in previous years. We might want to think about what to do with  
8 recyclable in some other way. I don't have solutions here, but it's something we need to think  
9 about. It's something we want to do, but there's no market anymore.

10 **Co-Chair Keller:** Thank you. Are we timing this by the way? Thank you. Jennifer.

11 **Jennifer Hetterly:** I was going to make the same point about soil. I think that needs to be here  
12 somewhere. I would put it with—I don't know—either land or water. Storm water, I think,  
13 maybe belongs better with climate change and adaptation, because that's so closely tied to  
14 increased flooding and storm water management and sea level rise together. Also, I wanted  
15 to—I'm not going to go on. I wanted to draw everybody's attention to the (inaudible)  
16 groundwater piece that was submitted in the at-places comments. There's an FAQ that is really  
17 informative and useful. I encourage everybody to read it. It talks a lot about groundwater, and  
18 it talks a lot about soil impacts. It's not just about basements. Please do read it carefully before  
19 we have a further discussion about this element. Thanks.

20 **Co-Chair Keller:** Thank you. Elaine.



**COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE**  
**CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE**  
*DRAFT MINUTES*

1 **Elaine Uang:** Mine are picky thing. Under safety, I think you've got solid waste twice, both for  
2 infrastructure. I generally do like the recommendation and the way that this is organized. I'm  
3 just kind of poking around at some other elements. It is interesting. The infrastructure piece,  
4 I'm glad that there is an infrastructure piece. I think that's actually really important and  
5 captures a lot of the things that—I guess safety is probably the right place. It captures a lot of  
6 things that are important to the urban landscape but also in service of protecting our natural  
7 environment. I think maybe the only thing might just be, since we're talking a lot about water  
8 resources, this sort of overarching category of watershed management, which isn't really  
9 captured either under water resources, but it could be in a couple—the water thing is really  
10 tough because you've got to bridge everything. I think this is probably as good as it gets, but  
11 maybe watershed management could be placed under water resources.

12 **Co-Chair Keller:** Thank you. Were you on the committee, Adrian? What we'll do is if you did  
13 not just speak, then please put up your tent. We'll go around. If you put up your tent, I guess  
14 next is Bonnie. Yes, go ahead.

15 **Annette Glanckopf:** Are we just talking about the organization now or are we talking about  
16 general comments?

17 **Co-Chair Keller:** Any comments that you have overall.

18 **Elaine Costello:** It can be both.

19 **Co-Chair Keller:** Bonnie.



**COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE**  
**CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE**  
*DRAFT MINUTES*

1 **Bonnie Packer:** Just some comments about the organization. I'm just looking at the  
2 recommendation column. One thing that struck me is that the infrastructure way on the  
3 bottom deals a lot with water. Why wouldn't that be put in the natural environment section  
4 under water resources? We could have water resources, and then a section within that on the  
5 infrastructure related to water. It might make more sense. I don't see what infrastructure has  
6 to do with safety. The other thing I thought of was climate change and climate adaptation. It  
7 may flow better if that particular chapter of the element comes right after energy. A lot of  
8 energy policies and programs have to do with reducing greenhouse gases, etc. I think that  
9 would be a natural flow into that. Also, in the energy section, you might highlight if some of the  
10 policies are specifically related to climate change issues, that there be some kind of indicator,  
11 maybe mark it in green throughout the element that these are issues that are addressing  
12 climate change. It's kind of like what we did with transportation when we noticed that traffic  
13 congestion was affected by a lot of the policies. Climate change is one of these things that a lot  
14 of the policies in here may affect how we address climate change. The other couple of things  
15 on safety. I wonder if we want to add a category about privacy in terms of—I haven't thought  
16 this through. Just in terms of internet privacy, that kind of thing. I don't know if there's  
17 something that the City can do or what it would do, but I'm just throwing that idea out there.  
18 The solid waste, we have electronic recycling. I didn't see any mention of electronic recycling in  
19 this—other types of recycling. This is on the detail level on the lower hierarchy. It's a safety  
20 thing, and it has to do with urban forest and street trees. You've got to be careful about those



**COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE**  
**CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE**  
*DRAFT MINUTES*

1 roots. They lift up the sidewalks and create a safety problem. Somehow addressing the  
2 relationship of our urban forest with our urban environment and the unintended consequences  
3 like the roots. Some trees don't have the root problem, and others do. That kind of thing.  
4 Mountain bikes on trails is another safety and environmental impact issue that we may want to  
5 study.

6 **Co-Chair Keller:** Thank you. Julia.

7 **Julia Moran:** I just have a couple of quick things. One of the things, looking at Goal N-3, the  
8 urban forest. One of the bullet points was Downtown tree health. I am happy to have  
9 Downtown trees may benefit from targeted support policy or programs. I think we also need to  
10 look at other areas. Personally when I drive down Middlefield and I cross Oregon Expressway, I  
11 find a significant difference between the trees on the south side of Palo Alto and the north side.  
12 I think we need to be looking at the south side. I think like months ago, I couldn't find it.  
13 Someone said that as we've added trees, it's disproportionately been added to the north side of  
14 Palo Alto. If we're going to look at targeted areas, we need to look at the south side of Palo  
15 Alto. Also, why there aren't trees. I think one of the things is the rolled curbs. It's the  
16 responsibility of property owners. With the drought, people have turned off their water bills.  
17 We need to put something in here of being better at not just educating people but providing  
18 outreach to people who perhaps can't afford their water bills to keep the tree canopy. It might  
19 not necessarily be a south side issue, but it seems to be to me. In the recycled water section, I  
20 don't know. I'm just throwing this out there. That seems more like a Citywide thing. I don't



**COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE  
CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
DRAFT MINUTES**

1 know if we've looked at educating people about household gray water use. I know certain  
2 cities allow it and some don't. I don't know what Palo Alto's view is on that. Perhaps  
3 something to add in as well. Thanks.

4 **Co-Chair Keller:** Thank you. Jason.

5 **Jason Titus:** A couple of things. One was actually the same thing around water. I was glad to  
6 see that there was things around rainwater capture. That seemed like a good thing to be  
7 planning for. To do that well, that's usually something for new construction or renovation to be  
8 able to actually have any substantial water storage. Also gray water is something that it seems  
9 like would be worthwhile calling out just because that is something that is much easier for  
10 existing households to be able to do. Actually I had one other thing, but I didn't write it down,  
11 and I don't remember what it was.

12 **Co-Chair Keller:** Thank you. Mark.

13 **Mark Nadim:** Looking at the table, I'm a bit confused of what—what am I supposed to  
14 understand from this table? I think we need to do a little bit more work on this to either fill  
15 more boxes or—I don't know. I don't know what it is for. Looking at the Natural Environment  
16 Element, there is a graph on page whatever. It's a graph of the projected water demand, which  
17 is very outdated. I'm sure the water usage in Palo Alto is much lower now than what it used to  
18 be. For Foothills Park or actually the open space which is about one-third of the City area to the  
19 south, southwest of the City, it's our natural environment. It's a treasure for us. Currently the  
20 Foothills Park is exclusive to Palo Alto residents' use. Every few years we hear people who want



**COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE**  
**CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE**  
*DRAFT MINUTES*

1 to open it to the rest of the public, to other cities. I think that's the wrong thing to do. The  
2 more people using it, the higher the risk of a wildfire. We look at what happened in the recent  
3 forest fires that were caused by humans. The more humans you have, the higher the risk of  
4 fire. As for the urban forest, we have a lot of non-native trees. Now with the drought, a lot of  
5 the trees are dying. It would be great to replace all these aged or the dying trees with native  
6 trees rather than just bringing trees from all over the world. Thank you.

7 **Co-Chair Keller:** Thank you. Annette.

8 **Annette Glanckopf:** I'm really confused why we want to break this thing up. I agree with  
9 Bonnie that this infrastructure thing should be moved up to the natural environment, and  
10 climate change should be after energy. I actually wrote that down. Again, natural hazards  
11 certainly belongs in safety. I would vote to keep it as a chapter because there's very little left in  
12 safety at this point. Some high-level comments. We're talking a lot about trees. There's  
13 nothing in here that talks about Canopy, which is our tree organization. I have a longtime  
14 concern about the right type of tree planted in the wrong place or vice versa. I think we need  
15 to do a better job in our tree policies to make sure that we plant—maybe it's native trees or  
16 whatever—trees where roots are not going to mess up the sidewalks, etc., and that need little  
17 watering. I could go on about that. Talking about preserve (inaudible) trees and we're talking  
18 about incentives for carbon benefits. To me, I don't really understand that whole policy. If  
19 we're talking about increasing carbon benefits, it might be private development rather than  
20 public. To me it's either in the wrong place or not that. On the groundwater section, this is





**COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE**  
**CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE**  
*DRAFT MINUTES*

1 where we really, really need to buff it up or fluff it up with the dewatering. I don't have any  
2 policies that I'd like to suggest. I'm very concerned as well as the watering group on the  
3 cumulative impact of multiple buildings in a certain geographic area. I'll come back the next  
4 time with something like that. Many of these points are not really strong enough in my benefit.  
5 We talk a lot about educating customers throughout the Comp Plan. I'm really concerned that  
6 we develop these massive programs with massive literature that no one reads or they just  
7 throw away. I think we need to be very, very careful when we do that. I think we can do more  
8 with rainwater onsite. It'd be interesting to either have some new Code to develop  
9 underground water systems to collect water or incent people to have more rain barrels. That's  
10 not really a widely used program. I love the idea of permeable paving materials, but it's really  
11 much more expensive. I'd like to see some incentives for people to do that. Anyway, I've got  
12 lots more comments.

13 **Co-Chair Keller:** Thank you. Len.

14 **Len Filppu:** Thank you. Under water—I'm not sure exactly where this fits. I want to talk about  
15 grass. Under water resources, to save—Man, I want to talk about grass, man. Invariably, when  
16 a new house is sold, they put in new lawns and everything's all green and then people water.  
17 That's what I did when I bought my house. Over years you get into this habit of continuing to  
18 keep this little patch of green grass growing, even though it doesn't work in this environment.  
19 It's not natural to the environment. It's inappropriate. It's a big waste of water. I wonder if  
20 there's—I know the City used to have a program where they would help fund changing lawns



**COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE**  
**CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE**  
*DRAFT MINUTES*

1 from grass to more indigenous plants and whatnot. I just wonder if the Comp Plan might be an  
2 area where we educate people about grass. It takes enormous amounts of water to try to keep  
3 a green lawn in this town. They're still all over despite the drought. I learned my lesson. I  
4 wonder if others might be able to do so too. I'd like to see something about the wastefulness  
5 of our green grass. Thanks.

6 **Co-Chair Keller:** Hamilton.

7 **Hamilton Hitchings:** I like the general organization. I do agree with Annette that safety is  
8 rather short, but I think there's a lot that the City needs to do over the next 15 years in  
9 improving our safety infrastructure, so that when things go wrong there will be much less  
10 impact and our City will be more resilient. Certainly myself, Annette and Lydia have spent a lot  
11 of time volunteering and working and being trained by the City in public safety, and we're all  
12 emergency responders if there's a big earthquake. I just had a few comments on the specific  
13 organization. First of all, I feel that it's important that flood be under safety. For some reason,  
14 under Subcommittee B there was a proposal that it be moved under. Because I was part of the  
15 flood of '98, wading around in the middle of the street, I talked to neighbors who woke up in  
16 their bedroom with 6 feet of water on De Soto Drive. I think it's critical, and we have some  
17 important projects on that. Infrastructure is very important because when there's an  
18 earthquake, it's important we have our electric grid and supply. There's some very important  
19 infrastructure projects like the Public Safety Building and fire station improvements that will



**COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE**  
**CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE**  
*DRAFT MINUTES*

1 need to be done. Lastly, we need to add crime as one of the bullets under public safety. Thank  
2 you.

3 **Co-Chair Keller:** Thank you. Shani.

4 **Shani Kleinhaus:** I'm looking at the key issues about the creek setbacks. I mentioned that  
5 before, I think. There is some (inaudible) in other groups, that they're looking at creek  
6 corridors. Especially for the areas up in the hills, 50 feet and what you can do in it is probably  
7 not enough. If you look at the County, they're requiring 150 feet. If you look at the habitat plan  
8 for Santa Clara County, it's 100 feet. If you look at San Jose, it's 100 feet. I think Palo Alto can  
9 look at that again. I don't expect that to be 100 feet from a concrete channel, but we do have  
10 some land where we could look at that again. There is many other issues. As we build too  
11 close to the creeks, then we have to reinforce those creeks, because people get flooded.  
12 There's a lot of benefit at looking upstream at what we can do there. Flood management could  
13 be part of that, but that's really not Palo Alto's jurisdiction. At least we can look at how we plan  
14 next to creeks. The Stanford HCP, I think people need to understand what that is, what an HCP  
15 is, what the Stanford HCP is. It says here that the Comp Plan Update could substantially affect  
16 special status species if it allows development in certain areas. HCPs are created to allow  
17 development in sensitive areas. What they provide is the permits to build on a sensitive area.  
18 In return, pay fund or protect area somewhere else. We need to understand this in relation to  
19 these land uses and consider those in discussion. Those are things that I wanted to especially  
20 mention. The issue with the streamside review area, I think, we do need to update the plans



**COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE**  
**CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE**  
*DRAFT MINUTES*

1 there. What's in here is just the tip of the iceberg of how important it is to protect creeks. One  
2 thing that Julia talked about. The Urban Forest Master Plan actually is looking at the  
3 discrepancy between north and south and looking to find why and to remedy that. I don't  
4 know if it will be successful, but there is definitely attention to that. Just so you know. I'm  
5 looking for some drought solutions. Drought is another issue that we have. Somehow it keeps  
6 coming up, but we don't actually have that as a category anywhere. I don't know if we need it  
7 as a category by itself, but we need to talk about drought as something that we need to deal  
8 with. There's something about the urban forest in coordination with PG&E, but I think it's really  
9 Palo Alto Utilities that we have to deal with here and not PG&E. That's about it for now.

10 **Co-Chair Keller:** Thank you. Whitney.

11 **Whitney McNair:** Thank you. I would love to take Shani up on the offer to meet with staff to  
12 talk about the Habitat Conservation Plan. Just for reference, within the staff report the Habitat  
13 Conservation Plan is sort of incorrectly described. It talks about the plan covering lands within  
14 the City of Palo Alto including Lagunitas. It's Lagunitas Reservoir, and actually that's within the  
15 county. The only area that's within the City of Palo Alto that's not already developed, that's  
16 covered by the Habitat Conservation Plan is actually Coyote Hill. That's the area east of Page  
17 Mill Road, the undeveloped area right now. The rest of the area is either within the  
18 unincorporated Santa Clara County or in the Research Park is already developed land. There  
19 are several policies in the open space section that refer to maintaining the Stanford Lower  
20 Foothill property that's predominantly within the City. I just don't know which areas the plan is



**COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE  
CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
DRAFT MINUTES**

1 talking about. It would be helpful to clarify specific areas. It even talks about Policy N-1.9, all  
2 development in the Foothill portion of the planning area, i.e., above JSB. That area's not within  
3 the City and wouldn't have to comply with the City's open space development criteria. It's  
4 actually governed by the County and the community plan within the County. There are very  
5 stringent regulations within the County. It's a concern that I've had even in the Land Use  
6 Element, that it doesn't accurately describe what's within the county and governed by the  
7 County plan and what's within the City of Palo Alto. We've gone a long way in the Land Use  
8 Element to take out areas outside the sphere of influence, but still it's hard to distinguish what's  
9 on Stanford lands, outside of the City of Palo Alto's jurisdiction. The only other thing I'd  
10 comment is on Policy N-12.1. It's the target to reduce greenhouse gas emissions to 80 percent  
11 below 1990 levels by 2030. That's much more aggressive than Governor Brown's new  
12 legislation of 40 percent below 1990 levels by 2030. I just want to make sure either that's  
13 consistent. This is where we're bringing in the S/CAP and targets are mirroring each other.  
14 Thank you.

15 **Co-Chair Keller:** Thank you. Alex.

16 **Alex van Riesen:** Can I make one comment? I think if you're not speaking, you can turn your  
17 mic off. I think that's some of the feedback. I heard someone talking during one of ... Maybe  
18 they're just the voices in my head.

19 **Female:** (inaudible)



**COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE**  
**CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE**  
*DRAFT MINUTES*

1 **Alex van Riesen:** Yeah, you guys were on. We heard all the vicious things you were saying. I  
2 was thinking another way to organize this instead of land, water—what was it? Land, water  
3 and air. Why don't we change it to earth, wind and water? I thought it might be a little  
4 catchier. I like the organization. The only one that struck me, near the end under the Safety  
5 Element, was the natural disasters. It might make—I appreciated Shani's comment. I would  
6 suggest moving fire down to community safety and emergency, and put drought in there, and  
7 call them something like natural threats. They might be disasters; that's even a scarier word.  
8 Some category or collective threats that seismic, flood and drought are things that will affect  
9 the City as a whole. Unless you guys were thinking like a fire that was going to take out all of  
10 Palo Alto. That wasn't what you were probably thinking. I also didn't see anything more  
11 content-wise. Does stuff like other forms of energy get picked up in this element? Like solar or  
12 geothermal or stuff like that, is that just ... I was thinking something that talks about—with  
13 things that are changing, it seems like energy sources and renewables should be predominant  
14 somewhere in this. Is there a plan or any kind of thought for a connected city, sort of the digital  
15 idea of how are we going to be a city—are we going to go wireless? What's the view of that for  
16 Palo Alto and the effect of that on the environment? I also thought under the urban forest,  
17 under the comment stronger protections, I also noticed there was no comment about  
18 replacement of trees due to drought or disease. It was sort of not allowing the canopy or  
19 whatever—I was also wondering how drought is affecting that and affecting the overall amount  
20 of trees and the canopy.



**COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE**  
**CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE**  
*DRAFT MINUTES*

1 **Co-Chair Keller:** Thank you. I have a few comments. The first is that we have under natural  
2 environment climate change and climate adaptation. I guess I'm done. Thank you. We have  
3 sea level rise there. Yet, we have flooding under natural hazards. I think those should go  
4 together. Separating those seems strange to me. I'm not sure whether climate change and  
5 climate adaptation may be safety issues. I'm not sure how you handle that. Think about that a  
6 little bit more. I agree with adding drought. I also pointed out in terms of sea level rise that the  
7 description on page 14 of the staff report refers to safer Bay levees between San Francisquito  
8 Creek and Redwood City. In fact, we are actually studying it on our side of the San Francisquito  
9 Creek to south Palo Alto through Adobe Creek. In fact, I made the motion for the Planning  
10 Commission to initiate that in terms of working with the JPA on that. I'd like to see that added.  
11 The other thing is in terms of grass we do participate in the Santa Clara Valley Water District's  
12 program for cash for grass, which is replacing grass with cash. In fact, Palo Alto matches the  
13 amount that the Water District provides. I think it may also be worthwhile thinking about—I'm  
14 not sure where this fits in. Sometime in the not too distant future, there'll be a new Stanford  
15 General Use Permit. I'm not sure where that fits in and what the policies of that are, but  
16 somewhere in the Comp Plan we might think about what Palo Alto wants to have out of a new  
17 General Use Permit. Finally, in terms of the issue of waste, I would like us to think about the  
18 idea of extended producer responsibility, which is the standard technical term for the idea of  
19 you make it, you deal with it. If you're dealing with recycling and waste and all that kind of  
20 stuff, promoting the idea of (inaudible) responsibility and whether we actually implement



**COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE**  
**CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE**  
*DRAFT MINUTES*

1 policies on it or whether we simply work in terms of encouraging government agencies to adopt  
2 it, it is something that is a solution to the problem instead of trying to subdivide it into different  
3 categories and deal with it. With that, unless there is—Annette, you have a burning issue?

4 **Annette Glanckopf:** I just wanted to sort of resonate with what Alex said. The whole Safety  
5 Element really needs to be aligned with what emergency management is doing right now.  
6 They're in the process of doing this big threats and hazards, natural environment, human made  
7 and biological. Alex was right on. Drought is included. Flood's included in that. When we  
8 come back or when I go to the safety committee, I'd like to make sure that's aligned, because it  
9 is not now. You were right on.

10 **Co-Chair Keller:** Thank you very much. I hope we don't have to add pestilence, hail and boils.  
11 Don.

12 **Don McDougall:** Just a quick comment. I think if we looked at the Safety Element instead as a  
13 risk element or a risk management element, because that's what you're dealing with here, then  
14 it would be easier to categorize what kind of risk are we dealing with, a natural risk or are we  
15 dealing with a manmade risk or whatever within that section. It's really risk that we're dealing  
16 with in all of those pieces.

17 **Co-Chair Keller:** Thank you. Elaine, you wanted to say something? Microphone.

18 **Elaine Uang:** This conversation jogged my brain a little bit. I think along with the risk comes  
19 the infrastructure. Obviously there's defining the risks and the challenges and then how do you  
20 deliver the solutions and manage that. I do think that Alex's point about the digital





**COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE**  
**CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE**  
*DRAFT MINUTES*

1 infrastructure is particularly important. I might even just consider reshaping this and not just  
2 calling it safety, but safety and infrastructure because I think those two things go together. One  
3 is defining what the problem can be, and then the other is the delivery mechanism for those  
4 solutions.

5 **Co-Chair Keller:** Thank you. Hillary would like to add a few remarks.

6 **Hillary Gitelman:** I just wanted to make one observation. Sort of like when we've been  
7 working on other elements and we're incorporating by reference and tiering off of them, like  
8 Urban Forest Master Plan is a good example, Parks Master Plan. We've talked about those in  
9 the context of other elements. For this element, there are other plans going on. Annette  
10 referred to one, the threat hazard mitigation plan. There's a much more specific and detailed  
11 planning effort going on around that. I don't think our role is to repeat that, but to be  
12 compatible and consistent and supportive of those goals. To the extent that the committee  
13 members want further education about what those other plans contain and what the status of  
14 them are, we can provide that to you. I just don't want us to have to rethink everything that's  
15 already been put in motion.

16 **Co-Chair Keller:** Thank you. I'll add one remark about creeks. I think that we should think  
17 about, as is mentioned here, separating the notion of the riparian corridors in wildland creeks  
18 as opposed to the creeks in the flatlands that we've spent tens of millions of dollars  
19 channelizing Adobe Creek and Barron Creek and Matadero Creek. We're not going to tear  
20 down those creek walls and eliminate the houses in order to create a riparian corridor. That's



**COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE**  
**CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE**  
*DRAFT MINUTES*

1 just not going to happen. When we update our riparian corridor ordinance, which I think makes  
2 sense to improve it for the wild creeks, we should also make sure that we don't onerously affect  
3 the people who are near the channelized creeks that are going to stay that way. Alex, you have  
4 the last word.

5 **Alex van Riesen:** Two quick things. For your comment, Hillary. Is it possible when you redo  
6 this, rather than duplicating, maybe you could put an asterisk where there's any other plan, like  
7 Annette was mentioning, and then note that at the bottom with a website that we could go to  
8 from that. The other thought I had was just a quick thing when I was reading this. On the Point  
9 6 or whatever, hazardous waste, I was just struck by the very thing that said discourage the use  
10 of toxic and hazardous materials. That just seems sort of soft. I was just sort of curious. Is it  
11 possible to use the word eliminate or is it just a part of life that you have to have toxic and  
12 hazardous materials? I was just curious why it was only discourage or wag your finger viciously  
13 at them.

14 **Hillary Gitelman:** Did you drive here this evening? Gasoline could be considered one.

15 **Alex van Riesen:** I get it. That's what it is? Okay.

16 **Hillary Gitelman:** They're ubiquitous.

17 **Co-Chair Keller:** Thank you very much. I think we've done a great job. I'm impressed. We  
18 finished the Land Use Element and recommended that on to the City Council. We did a very  
19 admirable job in not quite an hour on the Natural Environment Element.

20 **Feedback for Continuous Improvement:**



**COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE  
CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
*DRAFT MINUTES***

1 **Future Meetings:**

2 Next meeting: October 18, 2016 – Rinconada Library (Embarcadero Room)

3 Topic: Natural Resources Element II

4

5 **Adjournment: 8:25 p.m.**

6 **Co-Chair Keller:** With that, we will be adjourned at 8:25 p.m. Thank you very much.